

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* is completed with the issue of the second volume. The publishers have sent a copy of the volume for review.

---

It is a large volume. No reviewer can be expected to discuss its contents from the beginning to the end. Let us look for a little at the last article.

---

The last article has been written by Professor Sanday. Its title is PAUL. No greater satisfaction can come to an editor than the satisfaction of placing the most important subjects in the most competent hands. In the second volume of this Dictionary the most important subject is St. Paul. Should any one wish to dispute that, in face of such topics contained in this volume as MESSIAH, NEW BIRTH, SERMON ON THE MOUNT, SIN, SON OF GOD, he will at least admit that it is the topic of most importance for the moment. For 'we are on the eve,' said Principal Iverach, in last month's EXPOSITORY TIMES, 'we are on the eve of a great controversy, the issues of which are more momentous than any that we have ever had.' It is the controversy whether Jesus or Paul is to be considered the Founder of Christianity.

---

And where should that controversy be  
VOL. XIX.—No. 6.—MARCH 1908.

recognized if not in an article on St. Paul in a Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels? We do not say that if it had not been for the controversy there would have been no such article. But there would not have been the same necessity for offering it to Professor Sanday. He knows that the controversy is coming. He is intimately aware of every sign of it. And although he builds his article on larger lines than is demanded by the alternative 'Jesus or Paul,' yet he keeps the alternative before him and gives his judgment unmistakably.

---

Professor Sanday's PAUL is the last of a series of articles which are placed together in an appendix. It may be read by itself. The others, to get the good of them, should be read together. They are all on the estimates which men have formed of Christ, and the influence He has had in the world. They are an attempt, as it were, to say what Christ has been to men at the date of the publication of the Dictionary. Will the Dictionary do anything in the way of giving Him a larger place and a more spiritual influence?

---

There are few who realize what the editing of a dictionary means in the present day. There are few who realize what it means even to see that each article possesses an adequate, and not overweighted, bibliography.

How near can one come to the assertion of the Divinity of Christ without asserting it? Dr. James Drummond comes very near. He does not assert the Divinity of Christ. He deliberately denies it. But we can take his denial more thankfully than the assertion of some apologists.

---

Dr. Drummond, who recently retired from the Principalship of Manchester College, Oxford, has been giving himself to the preparation for the press of a volume of Systematic Theology. He may not acknowledge the word 'systematic.' He even tells us that he has omitted certain doctrines. Nevertheless it is what we mean by Systematic Theology, and we could wish that all our systems hung together as systematically. The title of the book, however, is simply *Studies in Christian Doctrine* (Philip Green; 10s. 6d. net).

---

Where is it that Dr. Drummond approaches so near to the assertion of the Divinity of Christ? It is when he comes to speak of the death of Christ upon the cross. Where else should it be? It is when he speaks of 'the love which bore the cross' on Calvary. Where else *could* it be? 'The love which bore the cross,' he says (we must quote his very words), 'was not merely the kindness and affection of a man; for love is not the accident of flesh and blood, but belongs to the eternal realm. The regard which all men feel for kindred and friends may be said, in distinction, to belong to the natural order; but the love which is a pervasive character of the soul, and, without waiting for sympathetic objects, flows perennially from the deep springs of its own independent life, is of heavenly origin. "Love is from God, and every one that loveth has been born from God" (1 Jn 4<sup>7</sup>). It was, then, the Spirit of God himself living and working in him, that spoke to the world in Christ; it was Divine love that sustained him on the cross, a Divine pity and pardon for sin that bore the scorn and shame. And may we not add Paul's thought, that the love of God was shown, in that he "spared not his own Son" (Rom. 8<sup>32</sup>)?'

We must speak in figures, he hastens to add. No doubt. When we speak of the things of God we must always speak in figures. But how near Dr. Drummond's figures are to the facts which the Church has held to throughout the ages of its existence. 'And so,' he goes on, 'we may say with all reverence, and knowing the inadequacy of our speech, that the heart of the infinite Father is touched when, through love to sinful man, he puts his Spirit upon his Beloved, and sends him forth to pain and death that he may establish a Divine kingdom in the world.'

---

This is true of all saints, says Dr. Drummond, true 'in its measure.' It is so. And when he adds that the light of heavenly love which is the reconciling power of the world 'reaches its focus on the cross,' we may be well content to let him add that it is diffused in many-coloured rays through a multitude of souls. We may be well content; for the essential thing is the reconciliation. And Dr. Drummond does not find the reconciliation in any of those many-coloured rays of love which are diffused through a multitude of souls. He finds it in the love of God in Christ. He finds it in the love of Christ on the cross.

---

'Ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called' (1 Cor. 1<sup>26</sup>). They saw it at the beginning. We see it still. We see it in India, and have been somewhat stumbled by it there. We see it at home. We see that when a poor man becomes rich his sons reject the God of their father. We see that when an ignorant man gives his sons a liberal education they use it to turn his hope into shame. He was persuaded that neither death nor life would separate him from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus his Lord: they can discover no lordship in Christ or love in God.

---

No doubt it is inevitable that if the gospel makes its appeal to everybody it should count



its greatest number of converts among the masses. That is so just because they are the masses, just because they are the greater number. But St. Paul means more than that. He means that the converts from among the mighty and the noble are not in proportion to their number. And that is what we mean still. But it does not seem that the fact has received all the attention which it deserves. For the amazing thing about it is that when this disproportion is spoken of by the preacher it is always spoken of as a matter for rejoicing. \_\_\_\_\_

The Rev. William Allen Whitworth was a preacher. There was published recently a volume of Mr. Whitworth's Sermons, called *Christian Thought on Present-day Questions*. There has now been published another volume entitled *The Sanctuary of God* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net). In the new volume we find Mr. Whitworth considering the question why so few of the mighty and the noble are called. We find him rejoicing, as a preacher rejoices, that not many wise men are called. \_\_\_\_\_

He thinks that St. Paul rejoices in it. He thinks that St. Paul rejoices not merely in the fact that a great many of the 'low' and the 'foolish' are called. For he could not but rejoice in the fact that the gospel is preached to the poor. He thinks that St. Paul absolutely rejoices in the fact that the disproportion between the numbers of the rich and the poor is greater than it ought to be. For it is the glory of the gospel that it makes no appeal whatever to the wise or the wealthy. Mr. Whitworth believes that we have not yet taken Christ's words at their full value, when He rejoiced in spirit, and said: 'I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes; even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight.' \_\_\_\_\_

But surely, if the gospel is true, the wise man should be the first to recognize it. Yes, if the

wise man is the first to recognize every kind of truth. But that is not so. For there are different kinds of truth. And while the wise man may be the first to recognize the truth that he is wise in, he is just on that account likely to be the last to recognize the truth which is outside the range of his wisdom. \_\_\_\_\_

Mr. Whitworth takes an example. He is courageous enough to take Harnack. What is Christianity? asks Harnack. What is *anything*? asks Mr. Whitworth. The answer depends upon our faculties and capacities. What is the sun? It is the source of light to those who have the faculty to see. If there are creatures who have not that faculty, it is not the source of light to them. What is the sun? It is a source of heat. If there are creatures who are not affected by heat, it is not that source to them. What is the sun? It is a centre of attractive force. But there are those who have not the capacity to investigate motion. It is not an attractive force to them. The sun may have other properties of which we know nothing. But there may be other beings who can discern these properties. \_\_\_\_\_

What, then, is Christianity? Three things. It is a gospel; it is a call; it is wisdom. It is a gospel to the suffering and the unhappy. It is a call to the worldly and the sensual. It is wisdom to the wise. \_\_\_\_\_

First, to the suffering and the unhappy, Christianity is a gospel of comfort and hope. Are they unhappy for their own sins, or for the sins of others, or for the burden of evil which sin has brought into the world? The gospel does not ask. It is enough that they are unhappy. To all who suffer it says, 'Come unto me.' It says, 'The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin.' It says, 'All things work together for good to them that love God.' \_\_\_\_\_

To the man of the world, Christianity is not a gospel, it is a call. It is a call to temperance and self-control, to righteousness and justice, to a



higher standard of morals. Sin has its pleasures: it calls to the worldly man to leave them. The world has its pleasures: it calls to him to rise above them. The flesh has its gratifications which are neither sinful nor hurtful: it calls to him to crucify the flesh with its affections and desires. To the man of the world it says, 'How hardly shall they that are prosperous enter the kingdom.'

---

To the wise man Christianity is wisdom. It presents the deepest problems which his mind can occupy itself with, the deepest and the most fascinating. For the problems of Christianity are at once spiritual and of immediately pressing importance. It presents, for example, questions about God. Now there are many interesting things that the wise man may consider about God. But amongst these things is this, that God is a God with whom he has to do. Does he consider that? The wise man considers whether God is; does he also consider that God is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him?

---

Now then, when Christianity is offered to the sufferer as a gospel of solace, to the worldling as a call to the higher life, to the wise as the most exalted wisdom, which of the three will be most eager to accept the offer of grace? There is no need to ask. The worldling has no desire to be raised to a higher life. The wise man takes time to think. Felix was a worldling. He trembled, but said, 'Go thy way—when I have a convenient season.' The Areopagites were wise men. Some of them mocked; others said, 'We will hear thee again of this matter.' To the worldly and to the wise, Christ is ever saying, 'Verily I say unto you that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you.'

---

Thus Mr. Whitworth makes his distinction. But he does not forget that the suffering and the worldly and the wise are not always sharply distinguished. He does not forget that the three may be found in one man. If that is so, then to

that man Christianity comes with a threefold appeal. It appeals to him spiritually, morally, and intellectually. Is he a sufferer? It appeals to him as a gospel. Is he of the world? It appeals to him with a higher moral code. Is he a philosopher? It appeals to him as a new and ultimate philosophy. And by this threefold appeal men have been won to Christ. Mr. Whitworth names Lord Shaftesbury, and also Mr. Gladstone ('whose life we are all reading just now'). But he says, and this is the thing to be considered, that when these men are won to Christ it is not by the appeal to their conscience; it is not by the appeal to their intellect; it is by the appeal to their common human need. It is by the welcome tidings of pardon for sin, of grace here, and glory hereafter.

---

What is sin? The Shorter Catechism answers, 'Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God.' We are not so much interested as our fathers were in the Westminster Catechism and its answers. But we are quite as much interested in sin. And this is exactly how we understand it. When we pray we say that we have left undone the things which we ought to have done, and that we have done the things which we ought not to have done. Our language may be more poetical and less precise than the language of the Shorter Catechism, but our meaning is the same. Where did the Westminster Divines get their definition of sin?

---

Not from the Gospels apparently, and not from Christ. In the excellent English translation by Dr. Warschauer of a German book on *Jesus and His Teaching*, written by Erich von Schrenck (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net), there occurs this sentence, 'Jesus never uses the word "transgression," and does not regard sin in relation to the Law at all.'

---

The Jews, says von Schrenck, were always afraid of transgressing the Law. Paul had stood for a long time under this Jewish pharisaical system,



and his conception of sin remained tinged by his experience of it as opposition to the Law, so that all his life the sinner appeared to him as the transgressor of the Law. But Jesus lifted sin out of relation to the Law, and brought it into relation to God. He found the true life of man regarded as consisting in legal observance; He made it consist in personal communion with the living God. And He spoke of the sinner, therefore, not as a transgressor of the Law, but as a debtor to God.

Is von Schrenck right? If he is, what is to be done with that form of words which occurs in the Prayer Book version of the Lord's Prayer? The petition is, 'And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.' There is no form in which that petition is so frequently made. We know that it does not come from the Authorized Version; that the makers of the Prayer Book went back as far as Tindale for it. Were they mistaken? Have they represented our Lord as using a form of words which it was not possible for Him to use?

The leading article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January has been written by Professor J. M. S. Baljon, of Utrecht. Its title is 'Contributions from the History of Religions to the New Testament.' But the field in which Professor Baljon has made his reputation is the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. What has he to do with Religions?

He might answer that at present we all have to do with Religions. But he has a better answer than that. Textual criticism, exegesis, and introduction are not ends in themselves. They are means to an end. The end is the accurate representation of primitive Christianity. Now if anything should occur to affect that representation, if any movement should arise claiming to alter seriously the account which the New Testament gives of the origin and early history of Christianity, it may become the duty of the critic or the expositor to arrest his proper studies and examine that

movement. For if it is a movement that alters the very materials upon which he is working, he may find that much of his labour is misdirected or even thrown away.

Such a movement has arisen. It is known in Germany by the name of *religionsgeschichtliche Methode*, which, being freely translated by Professor Baljon, is 'The Aid which the Study of Religions provides for the Study of the New Testament.'

It is a *method*, you observe; simply a method of study. Could anything be more inoffensive? Perhaps the inventors of the *religionsgeschichtliche Methode* have profited by the infinite mischief that was done to literary criticism in calling it by a name that seemed so arrogant as 'Higher' Criticism. This is only a method of study. Yet if the Higher Criticism smote traditional Christianity with whips, this method is capable of chastising it with scorpions.

It is a method of studying the New Testament to discover what there is in it which has been borrowed from other religions. Now that also seems inoffensive enough. And it *is* inoffensive if it is properly conducted. But who is to conduct it properly? Dr. Baljon says that much depends upon the 'religious view-point' of the man who engages in the investigation. The man who sets out with a low estimate of the claims of Christ will find more legend and less history in the Gospels than the man who starts with a high regard for His claims and a strong veneration for His person.

There is therefore a certain responsibility lying upon every one of us. We may not be able ourselves to search the New Testament for traces of Mithraism; but we may consider the antecedents and scrutinize the motives of the man who does.

Professor Baljon acknowledges the right. And



for himself he tells us plainly that while he does not hold by any such rigid doctrine of the inspiration of the New Testament as the ancient Jews applied to the Old Testament, or the Muhammadans apply to the Quran, on the other hand he is convinced that Christianity is the work of Christ, and that He is—'I shall not say Founder of our religion, but Mediator and Lord, as He has been to the Christian Church these nineteen centuries.'

Does Professor Baljon find foreign elements in the New Testament, then? He does. And why, he asks, should he not? Does not a good Reformed theologian believe in the existence of 'common grace'? And did not the early Fathers hold that when Christ went down to Hades, Plato came forward to greet Him and was glad at His appearing?

He finds Plato in the New Testament. He finds him in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. The subject of the Prologue is the Logos. That is also the subject of the whole Gospel. For Dr. Baljon discovers the keynote of the Gospel in the 14th verse of the first chapter: 'And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth.' Now he believes that the doctrine of the Logos was not found by St. John in the Old Testament. At least not directly and not wholly. For five hundred years of religious development lie between the Old Testament and St. John. He believes that the doctrine of the Logos was derived from Philo, who in turn built upon foundations that were laid by Plato.

Again, he finds the influence of the Greeks in St. Paul. St. Paul's antithesis of flesh and spirit, and other parts of his psychology, are Hellenistic. So is the method of allegory which he applies to the interpretation of the Old Testament. Professor Baljon thinks that the Apostle to the Gentiles would not have spoken of 'this Hagar' as 'Mount Sinai

in Arabia' if the Greeks before him had not been driven to allegorize the stories of the gods in Homer and Hesiod in order to make them less offensive to the taste of their time.

He finds also reflexions, or at least phrases, of the Greek religion in St. Paul's references to a 'mystery' that had been hid, and to the 'seal' of Baptism. Besides the knowledge of the Divine which was within reach of those uninitiated in the mysteries of Greece, there was a knowledge which was attained only by the initiated; while that sacred and solemn ceremony which gave admission to fellowship with a Greek divinity was sometimes spoken of as a 'seal.'

But Professor Baljon is on surer ground, or at least he has more material to work upon, when he comes to the Apocalypse. We are already familiar with the discoveries which Gunkel and Bousset have made here. And if Professor Swete can say that 'of modern commentators, Bousset has helped me most,' we need not fear to follow the wary footsteps of Professor Baljon.

His first example is the seven eyes which (in Rev 5<sup>6</sup>) are described as the 'seven spirits of God which are sent forth into all the earth.' This, he contends, cannot be taken from the seven-branched candlestick of Exodus, or from the candlestick of Zechariah's vision, although the prophet declares that the seven lamps are 'the eyes of the Lord, which run to and fro through the whole earth.' Here, he says, we are compelled to call in the help of the star-gods of the heathen. The sun, the moon, and the five great planets, which were the heathen gods of light, were accepted by the Jews as angels of God, and were placed as guardians over nations, rivers, and lands. Thus they became the 'eyes' of God, and were represented in public worship by torches. But Dr. Baljon warns us that more definite than that we cannot be, and he says that when Gunkel identifies the seven stars of Rev 1<sup>16</sup> as the Small Bear he 'goes too far.'



The next example is the birth of the Messiah in Rev 12. This is a prophecy. That is to say, when it was written the Messiah was not yet born. This section, therefore, cannot have been written by a Christian, but must be the work of a Jew. Nor can the idea have been native to any Jew. For with the Jews the angels are always male. Female divinities are wholly alien. Here, then, in this woman who gives birth to the Messiah, we have a reflexion of the heathen ideas of the Queen of Heaven, whose very insignia she is made to wear.

---

These things Dr. Baljon calls 'fixed points' in the study of the New Testament. They may not amount to much, but he believes that they must be accepted. Then he comes to Buddhism.

---

Now it is very likely that one day a pitched battle will be fought between Christianity and Buddhism. And the very centre of it will be the question whether there are elements derived from Buddhism in the New Testament. There are differences between Christianity and Buddhism which the Buddhists, when the day of decision comes, will find it hard to account for. There is especially this difference, that Buddhism proclaims salvation from suffering, while Christianity offers salvation from sin. But if the Buddhists succeed in showing that the whole story of the miraculous birth of Jesus is modelled on the story of the birth of Buddha; or if they can show (according to Seydel) that one of the sources used by the Synoptists, especially by St. Luke, was a Buddhist Gospel, the struggle will be a prolonged one and the issue may be incomplete.

---

Professor Baljon has given twenty years' study to early Christianity. Recently he has spent himself upon a thorough investigation of these very claims. He has also called Professor Calland to his aid. And he has come to the deliberate conviction that there is not a trace in the Gospels of the influence of Buddhism, whether conscious or unconscious.

Then he turns to Mithra. His account of the worship of Mithra is masterly. And although he owns his obligation to Professor Cumont, he has some discoveries of his own. Now, that there are parallel passages between the religion of Mithra and Christianity is, he says, clearer than the day. Mithra is a Mediator between God and man, as Christ is. His earthly career is to him hardship and strife, to man blessing and salvation, as with Christ. When he is born, shepherds appear and kneel in adoration. And then, of course, there is the visit of the Wise Men, who are claimed to have been adherents of Mithraism. But Professor Baljon does not believe that they were adherents of Mithraism. And as to those interesting coincidences, they are interesting and no more. 'I take them to be accidental,' he says, 'and see no dependence of Christianity upon the Mithra cult, nor of the Mithra cult upon Christianity.'

---

It is true that in the history of the Church Mithraism made itself felt. We acknowledge it to this day. For in the course of the fourth century the commemoration of Christ's birth was changed from January 6 to December 25, in order to agree with the commemoration of the birth of Mithra. This was done probably with the object of weakening the Mithra cult, by giving its chief festival a Christian atmosphere. But it is the New Testament that we are concerned with at present. And Dr. Baljon cannot find in any part of the New Testament more than a few cases of interesting coincidence or a few examples of universal religious symbolism.

---

'The result I reach is this'—and his words are well worth quoting: 'The influence of strange religions upon primitive Christianity is not very important. He who would interpret Christianity can do so by means of the Old Testament, the later Judaism, and Hellenistic philosophy. By doing this he walks the old and tried way. But, above all things else, let the full light be concentrated upon the person of Jesus Christ, who is the Creator or rather the centre of the religion



that names itself after Him. If history in general cannot be understood without the significance of those exalted personalities who gave the impulse to any great movement, and who cannot be interpreted as mere products of their times, how much more does this apply to the sacred history of the origin of Christianity, in view of the person of Christ! To us He is the only-begotten Son of the Father, who has revealed the Father unto us. Give Christianity confidently a place by the side of other religions. Christianity contains whatever

is noble and divine in them, and much that they do not contain. Christianity recognizes the problem of sin, and proclaims the atonement of the sinner with God. Safely compare the Christ with Buddha or whomsoever you please. He raises Himself above them all, even as the Jungfrau in all her virginal glory rises high above her surroundings. The 'seeing' (*ὁρᾶν*) of the Son of Man, becomes a sight of admiration (*θεωρεῖν*), and the admiration ends in worship. *Sol Justitiæ, illustra nos!*

## Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.

BY THE REV. W. C. ALLEN, M.A., FELLOW OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

THESE are very simple words, and yet how they quicken the imagination. 'The kingdom of heaven'—is it the New Jerusalem which St. John saw coming down from God out of heaven, alight with the glory of God, splendid with its twelve gates, and its walls of gold, and its river of sweet waters, and its trees of life? Or is it the Church of God, the society of the faithful, the blessed company of all true-hearted saints, bearing through the ages of the world the gospel of God's goodness, terrible as a bannered army? Or is it the wide-spreading land towards which our eyes are turned, in which the king shall reign in righteousness, and princes rule in judgment?

And then the keys. To us English people the phrase suggests the barred gate or the locked door to be opened only by those who have the keys. And all this given to one man. 'I will give unto thee the keys.' No wonder that the figure of St. Peter has assumed a gigantic place in the imagination of men. What a position to hold! Janitor of the kingdom of heaven!

Or once again, how the words stir our imagination as we think of the influence that these short and simple syllables have exercised in European history, of the great system of ecclesiastical government built upon them, of the appeal made to them to-day, as through the nineteen centuries of Western civilization, in support of claims to authority over Christian men, and to their obedience. And truly any man or body of men would rightly claim our

solicitude and interest, if we knew that they could, in fact, open to us the door into that land of the blest, or throw back the gates of the city of God.

Let me give you one simple instance from a bygone age of the influence of these words upon the minds of simple men.

In the year 664 A.D. a conference of Christian bishops was held at Whitby. There were some matters of dispute between Christian men, and the king of Northumbria wished to see if some agreement could not be arrived at. He listened to the arguments on this side and on that until one speaker urged that the custom which he advocated had the authority of St. Peter. No further argument was necessary. 'I will not decide,' said the king, 'against the keeper of the door, lest when I come to the gates of heaven he shut the door against me.'

The same feeling influences to-day many who never heard of the Northumbrian king.

'I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.'

I wish this morning<sup>1</sup> to make one or two suggestions as to the possible meaning of these much debated words, and then to point out how these our brethren, who are to-day to receive their commission, hold keys of the kingdom in proportion to their office; and lastly, to show how, in a sense, all

<sup>1</sup> This sermon was preached in Lichfield Cathedral on September 22, 1907.



who are Christ's disciples share the responsibility of having keys of the kingdom.

What, then, are the keys? To a Jew educated in the Old Testament the phrase would probably suggest the idea of authority, and the office of a steward or high official, rather than that of a door or gate-keeper. From this point of view the phrase would denote administrative authority, and would be further explained and expanded in the words which follow. For to a Jew 'to bind' and 'to loose' was the work of the ecclesiastical lawyer, and meant 'to allow' or 'to forbid,' 'to declare legal' or 'illegal.' St. Peter was to hold the keys, *i.e.* he was to be supreme administrator; he was to bind and to loose, *i.e.* he was to be supreme legislator. It is not unlikely that as the evangelist wrote the words, these were the conceptions which arose to his mind as to the nature of St. Peter's position within the kingdom.

But if we put aside for a moment the clause about binding and loosing, which is elsewhere written, not of St. Peter alone, but of the whole body of Christian disciples, and think only about the keys, it will be clear that the idea involved in having the keys may be that of opening a locked door. It is so used elsewhere by Christ Himself. He said of the Pharisees that they had the keys of knowledge, but that instead of opening the door of knowledge for the people to pass in, they neither went in themselves, nor allowed others to do so. Now if the key promised or given to St. Peter was a key which opened the door unto the kingdom, we can hardly doubt what it symbolizes. For did not Christ speak of Himself as the door? 'I am the door,' He said. And what can be the key of that door but faith and trust in Him. This, indeed, is the keynote of the whole New Testament, that that which will admit men into the kingdom, that which alone is the sure pledge of their entry there, is faith and trust in Him as the Son of God, resulting in baptism into His name.

Now this it was which was St. Peter's claim to entry. He had just given utterance to the great confession in Christ as the Son of God. And Christ promised him that it should be his privilege to open the door for others, no doubt by bringing them to faith and trust in Him and to baptism into His name.

We may, perhaps, paraphrase the words as follows:—

'Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jona. Flesh and blood have not revealed it to thee, *i.e.* the truth to which you have just given utterance was not taught you by men, it came to you by direct revelation from the Father in heaven. Your name is Peter, which signifies a stone, something hard. And this truth to which you have given expression is also something hard, a rock. And a rock is good for foundation work. I will build My Church upon it. The community of My disciples shall be established on this truth of My Divine Sonship. And if this truth is from one point of view a foundation rock, it is from another a key which will admit into the kingdom where I shall reign. You have the key, it was given to you by revelation of God. You shall admit others, and give to them the same key by bringing them to faith in Me, to admission into the Church, to expectation of My kingdom.'

If this or anything like it was the meaning of the words as Christ spoke them, the keys are the belief in Christ as the Son of God, He Himself is the gate or door; this belief is also the rock, the Church is the body of Christ built upon the rock, and the kingdom is the reign of Christ for which the Church hopes and towards which she looks.

And it may be noted here in passing that if we wish to see how St. Peter himself understood the words about the rock, we must turn to his Epistle. There we shall find him saying that Christ is the living stone upon which the Church is being built up. 'To whom coming,' he writes, 'as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious, ye are being built up a spiritual house.'

Thus when the mind of St. Peter was illuminated by Divine revelation, when he saw as by a sudden unveiling that Jesus of Nazareth whom he had loved and served as a gracious and wise teacher was in truth the Divine Son, the manifestation in human life of the unseen and unknown God, there were put into his hands the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Through this same door of belief in the Incarnate Son of God all who should come into the kingdom would enter. And he was the first to hold the keys. But through the door others should come too. Did St. Peter's mind by some light of inspiration pierce but for a moment the veil of the future? Did he see the countless hosts of the saints flocking from east and west through that door which is Christ, by means



of those keys which are faith and trust in Him? Did he see them pressing into the spiritual house, slowly being erected by unseen hands, upon Christ the living rock? Did he see them, possessed like himself of the keys of the kingdom, calling others into the Church? Perhaps not, for St. Peter was no seer or visionary, but, as it would seem, a man of matter-of-fact mental fibre. But at least his after-life, and the letter which he wrote are a witness to his faithful obedience to his commission. He lived henceforth and died in the work of calling men into the Church, handing on to them, and through them to others the keys of the kingdom.

And to-day, my brethren, we are assembled to see some of our brethren entrusted in a special sense with keys of the kingdom. They are to receive through divinely appointed channels authority to preach the Word of God and to administer the sacraments. What are these but keys by which men enter into faith and communion with Christ, the Incarnate Son of God, by and through whom alone men may hope to enter the kingdom in which He shall reign. Let us pray for them that they may be sustained with Divine grace for the great work laid upon them. To be thus entrusted with keys of the kingdom is a great privilege. It is also a great responsibility. In this modern world of ours, with its perplexities and its passions, the one hope of men is now as ever Christ the Incarnate Son of God. He draws, as He foretold, all men to Himself. But He draws through the disciples whom He inspires, through the Church which He founded, through the sacraments which He ordained. He is the door. These as means of union with Him are the keys. But how great is the responsibility of those upon whom is laid the privilege of holding the keys. If they adulterate His Word, if they misrepresent the Church, if they do not faith-

fully administer the sacraments, they will turn away from Christ the door, those who would enter, and upon them shall rest the condemnation, 'Woe to you, for ye have the keys—but ye prevent those who would enter in.'

We send them forth with our prayers that they may faithfully use the keys, that they may unlock for many that door which is Christ, and that by their means the body of the faithful who labour and pray for the kingdom may be built up and enlarged.

And lest any of us should forget that not upon these, our brethren alone, but upon all of us who are disciples of Christ, there is laid in some measure this responsibility, let us remember that we too have keys of the kingdom. Christ is the door, and we may all help to open that door for some whom we know. Indeed, perhaps, we never really understand into what a kingdom of light and love, into what a paradise of God He is the door, until we have helped to let someone else in. Even the humblest of us may do that. You may not have been called to be a minister in the Church of God, but you have certainly been called to let others know and see that for you He is the door into the kingdom. Is He for you the Sun of your life, beneath whose bright rays darkness and mist are disappearing? That is a key, use it. Have you strong hope in the brightness of the future, because He abides for ever, and heaven will be where He is. That is also a key, use it. You know, *e.g.*, someone whose life is darkened by doubt or by perplexity, by sin or by sorrow, go and help them. You cannot, perhaps, as it seems to you, do much, or say much. But go, because you love Christ, and know that He loves them, and do your best. If you go in that spirit you shall perhaps, even though you do not know it, help to unlock for them the door into the kingdom of heaven.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### Wellhausen and Harnack on the Book of Acts.<sup>1</sup>

THE eight notes of Wellhausen concern emendations and interpolations of the text, which impinge

<sup>1</sup> *Noten zur Apostelgeschichte.* Von Julius Wellhausen. 'Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissen-

more or less seriously upon the historical value of certain passages. As Harnack's essay discusses *schaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. 1907. Heft 1. Pp. 1-21.*

*Die Zeitangaben in der Apostelgeschichte des Lukas.* Von Adolf Harnack. 'Sitzungsberichte der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. xxi. 1907.' Sonderabdruck.



primarily the chronological expressions of the book, the two critics hardly cross each other's path, except at one point, namely, 24<sup>27</sup> (διετίας δὲ πληρωθείσης ἔλαβεν διάδοχον ὁ Φήλιξ Πόρκιον Φῆστον). Wellhausen (pp. 8-9) thinks this interval of two years in the legal process is an 'absurd hiatus,' and proposes to refer the διετία to Felix's tenure of office. The suspicion is gratuitous. As Luke has already noted (24<sup>10</sup>), Felix ruled for more than two years; the context (cf. v.<sup>26</sup>) favours, if it does not suggest, a lengthened period of intercourse between the governor and his prisoner; and to connect the διετία with the general rule of Felix instead of with the trial of Paul, does violence to the trend of the surrounding history, where the latter is the central figure. Besides, as Harnack stops to point out (pp. 4-5), this allusion to years, which the historian leaves a blank in his record, is entirely consonant with Luke's general method (cf. e.g. 11<sup>26</sup> 18<sup>11</sup> 19<sup>10</sup> 28<sup>30</sup>). Wellhausen's interpretation, in short, betrays an inadequate appreciation of the historian's practice. It smacks of the casual, and this impression is borne out by an odd remark in the same note, in which he confesses he has been struck by an allusion in Pfeleiderer's *Urchristentum* to a theory that the true place for the journey of Paul and Barnabas to the council of Jerusalem is to be sought in 11<sup>30</sup>. 'I do not know who started this hypothesis,' he adds naively! Wherever Wellhausen has been living of late, evidently it has not been in the criticism of Acts. What seems to him a novelty has really been a commonplace of recent criticism. Those critics, however, who have for years sought to identify the two visits in 11<sup>30</sup> and 15<sup>2f.</sup> will welcome Wellhausen's adhesion to their hypothesis (pp. 7-8). Similarly, but unconsciously, he is in agreement<sup>1</sup> with critics like Spitta, McGiffert, and J. Weiss when he takes ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ . . . ἡμῶν in 1<sup>22</sup> as an interpolation (pp. 2-3). This is tenable, yet it is extremely difficult to admit that συναλιζόμενος in 1<sup>4</sup> refers, not to continuous intercourse, but to one special meeting, and that the last. Did the participle refer to the final interview, in the sense not of eating<sup>2</sup> but of intercourse, as Wellhausen

alleges (p. 2), the aorist would have probably been chosen. And the context indicates that Luke is alluding here not to the final meeting (as in v.<sup>6</sup>), but to the previous period.

Wellhausen's further conjectures vary in plausibility.<sup>3</sup> Like several other critics, he suspects that in 12<sup>17</sup> the original source had the name of some place, which was omitted by the editor in order to pave the way for what follows. Wellhausen (p. 9) makes εἰς ἕτερον τόπον a Lucan correction of εἰς Αντιόχειαν (Gal 2<sup>11</sup>). The general tradition of Ac 12 (p. 11 f.) he rightly considers to be accurate.<sup>4</sup> That the first bloody persecution of the disciples took place under Agrippa I. is to be explained by the fact that the Roman governors who kept the Jews in check were no longer in authority, while Agrippa's policy was to conciliate and favour the Jews. 'Possibly Mt 10<sup>23</sup> refers to this second persecution,' Agrippa being an example of the βασιλεῖς (10<sup>18</sup>) before whom the disciples were dragged. This may well be the case, but we should have expected an equal background for the ἡγεμόνες mentioned along with the βασιλεῖς.

In 18<sup>20f.</sup> Wellhausen (14 f.) is disturbed by the curt, enigmatic language of the story.<sup>5</sup> 'No American could improve on its telegram-style.' But it is a heroic remedy to regard, e.g., the departure from Ephesus to Jerusalem as an unhistorical digression, introduced, 'perhaps, in order to avoid bringing Paul into touch with Apollos at Ephesus'! This heroism is carried still further in the notes upon 19<sup>23-41</sup> and 27<sup>1-43</sup>. The rôle played by Alexander (19<sup>33</sup>) in the former passage is certainly curious, and the relation of Paul to the whole business is not clearly brought out. The ambiguities are patent. But it is to solve one difficulty by means of another and a greater, to

Christ's eating, after the Resurrection, have arisen from misunderstood expressions.

<sup>3</sup> He accepts, like Blass, ἄνας for ἀναστάς in 5<sup>17</sup> (p. 21).

<sup>4</sup> So does Harnack (p. 10) still, arguing that it is corroborated by the old tradition that the apostles were bidden by Jesus to remain twelve years in Jerusalem. This period covers 30-42 A.D.; and as the persecution of the disciples under Herod Agrippa (41-44 A.D.) must have taken place shortly before his death in 44 A.D., the two traditions tally.

<sup>5</sup> The whole section, 18<sup>18</sup>-20<sup>4</sup> (where the we-journal is resumed), is characterized by a confusion and hurry unusual in the rest of the book. The paragraph 18<sup>20f.</sup> does not deserve the description by Blass ('incipit narratio clarissima'). It gives one the impression of being abbreviated, to the point of obscurity, at some points, for all its vivid local colour.

<sup>1</sup> On the doubtful ground, however, that ἐπί (accus.) in this connexion cannot refer to permanent intercourse. The passage which he quotes from 1 Mac 13<sup>40</sup> is an inadequate witness, for καὶ εἰσπορεύεσθαι (xv) there is of very dubious authority.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Abbott (*Notes on New Testament Criticism*, p. 54 f.) unconvincingly argues that the Lucan references to



imagine, as Wellhausen would have us do (pp. 15-17), that Luke has adopted the story of an Ephesian outburst against the local Jews, written by an impartial though rather sly outsider, and adapted it for his own purposes. Even more improbable is the idea that (p. 17 f.) in ch. 27, vv.<sup>9-11</sup> 21-26 and the larger part of 33-38 are Lucan additions (like the mention of Paul in v.<sup>43</sup>) to the account of a stormy voyage to Rome which was written by someone else.<sup>1</sup> The presence of an interpolation in 27<sup>21-26</sup> has been often felt by critics, from Overbach to J. Weiss. Dr. H. P. Forbes, in the fourth volume of *The International Handbooks to the N.T.* (1907, p. 82), is the most recent adherent of this view. But this is far from involving the consequences drawn by Wellhausen. The style of the chapter connects too closely with the rest of the book, as Harnack has already shown, and the separate objections of Wellhausen to the ordinary view of the passage are too trifling or prosaic to need refutation, any more than Soltau's theory that 27<sup>1-28</sup><sup>16</sup> was originally a letter meant for some friends of the apostle (*Zeitschrift für die neueste Wissenschaft*, 1903, p. 130).

The essay is, in fact, ingenious rather than judicial. Harnack's is exactly the reverse; its results are more winning, because its arguments are better winnowed. He works from a careful study of the chronological data of Acts. Allusions to contemporary history here (e.g. 11<sup>26</sup> 12<sup>20f.</sup> 18<sup>2</sup>) are not only scanty but incidental; Acts has no synchronism like that of Lk 3<sup>1</sup>. Nor, unless in describing Paul's sojourn in important centres, does Luke condescend upon exact periods of years and months, a trait which tells in favour of his historical feeling as compared with the inventiveness shown by the writer of apocryphal Acts.<sup>2</sup> The exceptions to this rule are, of course, found in passages where he seems to have been an eye-witness. The frequent allusions to Jewish festivals seem to Harnack to indicate that Luke, even before his conversion, must have sympathized with Judaism in the diaspora (p. 11). This may be, but it is precarious to

find evidence for it in the notice of 18<sup>2</sup>. In the un-Hellenic use of ἡμέραι Luke shows a tendency to give his style a 'biblical' character; his varied uses of the word betray affinities to the LXX. But neither these nor the occasional conventional data of its chronology affect the title of the book to be regarded as trustworthy (p. 16). The proof of this is led at some length, and developed with considerable clearness. In chs. 6-12 Harnack admits frankly that the lines of chronology have been confused. 'In these chapters there are more gaps left than facts narrated' (p. 20). But the last word has not yet been spoken upon the historicity of the various fragments of tradition preserved in this second part of the book.

The closing paragraphs (p. 21 f.), upon Ac 28<sup>30, 31</sup>, add little or nothing to what the author has already written on the subject in his *Lukas der Arzt*. He is disinclined to think that Luke meant to compose a third volume. The *diēria* must have been followed, he argues, by Paul's ultimate release; but Luke did not describe the later activity of the apostle, as it was no longer of supreme importance to the great cause of missions. I cannot see that this psychological explanation is any improvement upon the view that the *diēria* ended with Paul's death.

Harnack's final note is worth transcribing. 'It is unlikely that Luke formally "edited" Acts with his own hand, for (1) a number of passages betray inequalities which show that the care of the final hand was wanting, and (2) the textual history of the book proves the existence of two or more editions. But, so far as chronology is concerned, one does not miss the last hand (this against Ramsay). In my opinion, we cannot point to any passage where an elaborate chronological notice, such as that of Lk 3<sup>1</sup>, would have been appropriate.'

JAMES MOFFATT.

### The Religion of the Old Testament in the Framework of the other ancient Oriental Religions.<sup>3</sup>

SELLIN's book springs from three lectures given by him last October at a Conference of pastors held at Dresden.

<sup>3</sup> Ernst Sellin, *Die alttestamentliche Religion im Rahmen der andern altorientalischen*. Deichert: Leipzig, 1908. Pp. 82.

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps, Wellhausen admits, he was a companion of Paul. 'But if not, we have another instance of what occurred in the editing of the passage about Artemis,' i.e. the incorporation of a story which was originally irrelevant to Paul.

<sup>2</sup> 'We may assert that, although Acts has no chronological scaffolding, it is a very respectable history. In this aspect [i.e. of chronology] it can well bear comparison with the historical productions of the age' (p. 16).



He starts by saying that the relation of the religion of the Old Testament to that of the other religions of the ancient East is the chief problem before Old Testament scholars to-day. He proposes, therefore, to put side by side the characteristics of the religion of Israel with those of the other religions as revealed by archæology. This he proceeds to do in successive chapters on (1) Ritual; (2) Custom, Morality, and Justice; (3) Treatment of the World and Nature; (4) Treatment of History; (5) Treatment of Life and individual Piety; (6) Faith in God and Teaching about God; (7) Ideas of Revelation. Under these heads he rapidly reviews all the chief practices, ideas, and personalities of the O.T. religion, with abundant illustration from the most recent discoveries; and, whilst fully recognizing the many similarities, concludes that the O.T. is inspired by a completely world-religion which was consummated in the new and creative spirit, resulting finally in Christ.

Sellin's position may be best illustrated by describing his attitude to a few test questions. (1) Whilst accepting the usual critical date for the promulgation of the Codes of D and P, he holds strongly the Mosaic origin of the Book of the Covenant. He considers that Winckler has proved, once for all, the untenability of the Wellhausen position that the Israelitish tribes on their entrance into Canaan were merely Bedouins. On the contrary, they were—'Semi-nomads, *i.e.* possessors of flocks, who had already, here and there, practised agriculture, amongst whom the tendency to a more settled life was already present, and who already, in North Arabia up to the borders of Palestine, stood in relation to fixed sanctuaries, at which naturally were found organized priesthoods.' Edward Meyer is quoted in support of this. Accordingly Sellin is able to declare as the three principles of Mosaism: (a) Jahweh from Egypt onwards the God of Israel; (b) Jahweh an invisible God, not to be represented by images, gracious, but also holy and righteous; (c) Jahweh at the same time the World-God, the God of all peoples, and of the individual. Sellin holds the second of these in a very different way from Winckler, who considers the Biblical religion a mere sect of the widely diffused teaching of the East; to him, on the contrary, it is the mark of revelation, and the entire East can offer no parallel to it. As to the third principle, it is admitted that

there is no documentary evidence for it, and little trace of it in pre-prophetic times; but it is claimed that it was implicit from the first, and afterwards theoretically unfolded by the prophets. (2) In his treatment of the prophets, Sellin makes great use of the recent works of Gressmann and Meyer. These writers have proved that the eschatological scheme of prophecy is not peculiar to Israel. On the contrary, Meyer describes the Egyptian plan of the future as depicting—'First, a time of heavy punishment, the annihilation of the national power, the desolation of the land and of its sanctuaries; then the glory of the Messianic kingdom, under the righteous god-beloved king from the old legitimate family, to whom all peoples will be subdued.' Even the doctrine of the remnant may be found. Sellin points out the possible consequences of this on the present late dating of Apocalypse in the O.T., mentioning Am 9, Hos 14, and Is 9. (One might add Joel, and Zec 12-14.) Accepting this scheme, which accounts for Amos' familiar use of the term 'Day of Jahweh,' he maintains that these conceptions were born again in Israel, completely ethicized in the best teachers, and adapted for the service of the true religion. He is thus able to treat the savager traits of O.T. Apocalypse as relics of pagan origins. The true direction of prophecy is seen in the mild and gentle prince of Zec 9, and in the suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. It is evident that a field of thought is here opened which has as yet been barely entered by British scholars. Whilst much, at present, is uncertain, further inquiry may be very fruitful.

(3) The sections on personal piety and experience, and the problems of sin and forgiveness, are full of suggestiveness, but can only be mentioned here. We pass to the author's views on the O.T. revelation of God. He considers Winckler's attempt to lay the essence of religion in teaching altogether mistaken. Such teaching might lead to an Abstraction, a Personification, a Synthesis, but never to a Person. If Moses had won his faith through speculation or theorizing, it would have been incumbent on him to convey this to the people. He did not do this because he found God through his own innermost personal experience, through revelation. The God he found was One never found elsewhere. Other gods had ethical traits, this God was One whose whole nature and sole requirement was goodness. Other gods were known esoterically,



by priests and scholars; Jahweh was known to every individual of the nation, and the claim of Dt 4<sup>7</sup> is justified. So Sellin sums up—‘There are almost the same religious ideas, customs, usages, correspondingly impressed by each people with its own idiosyncrasy, yet only in one has God Himself spoken, disclosed Himself, and this word of His has gradually transformed everything and made it new.’

The remarks on the relation of the Code of

Hammurabi to Moses, on the O.T. and Egyptian ideas of immortality, and many other topics, are full of interest, but cannot be dealt with in this brief notice. The book as a whole, proceeding from one who is an expert in both fields of study, deserves the most serious attention, and undoubtedly shows the direction in which a large section of O.T. scholars is moving.

WILFRID J. MOULTON.

Headingley.

## Babylonian Literary Redaction.

BY STEPHEN LANGDON, M.A., PH.D., OXFORD.

AN illustration of Babylonian literary composition taken from the religious literature may be of interest both to Old Testament critics and to general readers. In applying the methods of literary criticism to a Babylonian psalm the Assyriologist has often the advantage of being able to present the late composition which he desires to analyse, as well as the actual tablets from which the redaction was made. In the example which I am about to give, the theological and philosophical reasons, which led the redactor to borrow as he did, will be evident, so that this study has an interest not only for literary criticism, but for the history of religion.

Briefly the situation was this. In the early period of Babylonian literature, about 2500 B.C., a poet belonging to the cult of *Enlil* of Nippur, the central cult of the Sumerian Zeus, wrote a lamentation concerning a famine in Babylonia. This he composed in the classic language of that time, a language which was borrowed from the early and highly cultured Sumerians, whose pantheon and religion also went over to the Babylonians and was theologically developed by them. In fact, the Babylonians nearly always composed their psalms and ritual in this language, adding a Semitic and often bad translation, just as in the Roman Church of our time a translation of the Latin service is made into various vernaculars for the use of laymen.

Now the lament of the Nippur poet was composed during the very early period before Hammurabi, when Sumerian was probably understood by every one, and hence his psalm is in pure

Sumerian. Furthermore, his conception of the pantheon was the early one which based everything upon the principle of the trinity of sky, earth, and sea. In this trinity *Anu* was known as the god of the upper sea, above the canopy of heaven, and we have a seal in the British Museum representing this god in his realm of the upper sea, with streams of water pouring from his shoulders to give rain to the earth.<sup>1</sup> The second and most important member of the Sumerian trinity was *Enlil* of Nippur, the earth and sky god, who, like the Greek Zeus, was especially interested in the harvests and herds. In the cosmological speculations of this early people, *Enlil* was the one who reduced the demons of disorder and created heaven and earth. He was, moreover, a national conception. At his cult in Nippur sectional jealousies ceased, and both Semite and Sumerian, rising above prejudice of race and city, adored the personification of the powers of earth and air at this ancient shrine. The notion that his ‘word’ was a creative principle, a messenger to do his bidding, was also prevalent in this ancient mysticism—an idea which the Semites seem to have failed to understand, for the doctrine of the creative ‘word’ does not appear to have been revived with emphasis until the centuries just before Christianity. But of this important side of Babylonian mysticism I shall have opportunity to say more elsewhere.

The third member of the trinity was *Ea-Oanes*, god of the sea.

<sup>1</sup> *Guide to the Babylonian and Assyrian Antiquities of the British Museum*, plate xxiii. No. 3.

This short sketch will enable us to understand the original psalm from which later redactions were made. The text, which has not yet been translated, was published in the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of the British Museum*, vol. xv. plates xi. and xii. The following translation, which can be justified only by extensive notes, is, I think, at least approximately correct:—

1. Oh Enlil councillor,	doth any one comprehend thy form?
2. Thou art begifted with strength,	lord of the harvest lands.
3. Thou didst create the mountains,	oh lord of the grain fields.
4. Warrior of great strength,	father Enlil!
5. Thou art the powerful divine prince;	for creating posterity thou sustainest life.
6. As the air thou art all-pervading,	as the grain . . . (?)
7. The haughty,	the rebellious land thou didst humiliate. <sup>1</sup>
8. The proud (?),	the wicked highlands thou didst humiliate;
9. The land of the foe with violence	as a peg thou didst smite on the head.
10. The barbarous lands	thou didst subject.
11. 'I am the fortress of the lands,	their bolt am I.' <sup>2</sup>
12. The conceited	thou didst bring to naught. <sup>3</sup>
13. The gates of heaven	thou didst establish. <sup>4</sup>
14. The bar of heaven	thou didst pull back.
15. The fastenings of heaven	thou didst rend asunder.
16. The bolt of heaven	thou didst remove. <sup>5</sup>
17. The disobedient land	with desolation thou didst scatter.
18. The disobedient foe	thou didst not dread.
19. Oh lord, who hast sent hunger everywhere,	how long until thou be pacified?
20. The wrath of thy heart	can any one appease?
21. The utterance of thy mouth	brings destruction.
22. With thee is there one	who ventureth to make war?
23. 'I rule, and I subdue the heavens;	I am the prince of all peoples.

<sup>1</sup> Referring to Enlil's battle with the giants.

<sup>2</sup> Abrupt changes to the first person are frequent in these hymns.

<sup>3</sup> The references in lines 7-12 are to Enlil's conquest of the world in his mythological conflict with the demons of disorder.

<sup>4</sup> That is the eastern and western gates for the sun god to enter and depart.

<sup>5</sup> Lines 13-16 refer to the first sunrise. The same scene is described in the Legend of Creation.

24. The fish of the sea I entrap,	the birds of heaven I ensnare.
25. Husbandman who tends,	divine Enlil am I. <sup>1</sup>
26. Oh great lord,	hero . . . (?)
27. From thy right hand	no foe escapes.
28. From thy left hand	no evil-doer escapes.
29. . . . .	. . . . . (broken away)
30. When thou openest thy lips	the earth resisteth not (?)
31. When thou hast cursed the land of the foe,	none . . . (?)
32. Be thou pacified	oh Enlil.
33. Oh lord of the harvest lands,	of unsearchable heart art thou.
34. . . . .	of the gods art thou.
35. . . . .	of the Anunakki <sup>6</sup> art thou.
36. . . . .	Enlil art thou.
37. . . . .	of the Anunakki art thou.
38. Lord of song (?) . . .	Enlil art thou.

The theological and cosmological speculations of the third millennium B.C., from which period this psalm comes, had already given rise to the theory of a son of the great creative god who acts for him, especially in his direct contact with the world. This has already been pointed out by Professor Zimmern in his brochure, *Father, Son, and Intercessor*. But although speculative religion evolved out of Enlil the idea of a warrior son who takes his father's place in the conflict against the demons of darkness, so far as I know, this idea does not appear in the psalms of the priests of Nippur. But the idea is very early, for Ninib, Enlil's son, who seems to have been impersonated with the agencies of Enlil as subduer of nature, and hence a warrior god, appears on a monument of 3500 B.C. (*circa*) holding the mythological net with which Enlil overwhelmed the giants.

Be this as it may, the idea of the son coming in beside his father as creative and active principle became prominent in later Babylonian theology. In fact, the priests of Lagash, where Ninib the son was worshipped, seem to have composed psalms based upon this idea. Later, the priests of Kutha, a town whose cult was devoted to the god Nergal, lord of the dead, claimed for Nergal the rôle of son and creative god; and finally the priests of Babylon redacted all the earlier legends under influence of the sonship idea of Marduk.

We have, in fact, from some poet who belonged to the school dominated by the idea that Enlil's son Ninib actually defeated the powers of darkness

<sup>6</sup> Earth spirits.



and brought order out of chaos, a psalm based upon the old psalm to Enlil just translated. This psalm is, at least in its present form, a redaction of the sixth or fifth century B.C. In other words, a period of 2000 years lies between the original and the later imitation. This Neo-Babylonian lamentation which I am about to give is accompanied by a Semitic translation, and may have formed part of a popular hymn-book. The text has been published in the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, vol. v. pp. 632-635. The compiler, evidently without much originality, desired to write a lamentation concerning a famine; as he was under the influence of the theological notion of the sonship of Ninib, he redacted the old hymn into the following:—

[1-13. broken away]

14. The gates of heaven	thou didst burst through. <sup>1</sup>
16. The bar of heaven	thou didst pull back.
18. The fastenings of heaven	thou didst rend asunder.
20. The bolt of heaven	thou didst remove.

22. The disobedient land	with desolation thou didst scatter
--------------------------	------------------------------------

24. The disobedient foe	thou didst overturn. <sup>2</sup>
-------------------------	-----------------------------------

26. Oh lord who hast sent hunger everywhere,	how long until thou be pacified?
--	----------------------------------

28. The wrath of thy heart	can any one appease? <sup>3</sup>
----------------------------	-----------------------------------

30. Oh great lord	hero who [defended?] his father. <sup>4</sup>
-------------------	---

32. From thy right hand	no foe escapes.
-------------------------	-----------------

34. From thy left hand	no evil-doer escapes.
------------------------	-----------------------

36. When thou openest thy lips	the earth resisteth not.
--------------------------------	--------------------------

38. When thou hast cursed the land of the foe,	none . . .
--	------------

40. The man who worships thee	. . . . .
-------------------------------	-----------

*Reverse.*

42. The decrees of Enlil into his power	. . . [they confided].
---	------------------------

44. He made glad their hearts,	he made happy their minds.
--------------------------------	----------------------------

<sup>1</sup> Alternate lines contain the Semitic translation for the people. The translation is often incorrect, and shows traces of varying ideas.

<sup>2</sup> A gloss adds 'didst humiliate.' Notice the redactor does not repeat line 18 of the original exactly, since he wished to avoid any mention of the god turning back.

<sup>3</sup> Here the redactor leaves out lines 21-25 of the original.

<sup>4</sup> This is an evident change in the text: the original has no mention of *his father*.

46. The tablets of fate of the gods	into his hands [they confided]
-------------------------------------	--------------------------------

48. Unto Ekur <sup>5</sup>	the beloved temple . . . (?)
----------------------------	------------------------------

50. Unto Ekiur <sup>6</sup>	the sacred house he drew nigh.
-----------------------------	--------------------------------

52. Unto Ešmedu	the temple of the lifting up of eyes . . .
-----------------	--

54. <sup>7</sup> Unto Edub,	place of repose . . .
-----------------------------	-----------------------

56. <sup>7</sup> Unto Emetenursag,	the resting-place . . .
------------------------------------	-------------------------

58. <sup>7</sup> Unto E-ide-Anu,	temple of the prince . . .
----------------------------------	----------------------------

60. For the lord Ninib	they [created an everlasting?] name.
------------------------	--------------------------------------

62. The gods on their mountain,	as many as . . .
---------------------------------	------------------

64. Because of fear of him as a reed	they <sup>8</sup> . . .
--------------------------------------	-------------------------

68. The treasures of the mountain	they . . .
-----------------------------------	------------

70. The land disobedient unto Enlil	may he . . .
-------------------------------------	--------------

Unfortunately the opening lines of the lamentation, in which the titles of Ninib were probably given, are broken from the tablet. Nevertheless the nature of an ancient lamentation can be clearly seen from these two comparatively well-preserved tablets. Little is said about the calamity itself. The poet and his people are desolate. The mention of that fact suffices. The god who can stay the famine must be celebrated according to the legends of the past. When the heroic deeds of the god have been sung, and his character as personification of one of the principles of nature accurately described, the ancient psalm ends with a few lines of real prayer. But the rituals of the later cults worked out the theological notions of the different deities, so that frequently each lamentation to different gods took up several tablets. Thus the old lament to Enlil given above was worked over under influence of the father and son idea and attributed to Ninib. The familiar scene of the conclave of the gods on the mountain is brought in, and the tablets of fate are given to the son of the great father if he will go forth to war against the demons of chaos. After his victory the gods adore the son. The prayer at the end of the redacted psalm is in a fragmentary condition. From it we learn that the psalmist appeals to heaven and earth, to gods and temples, to intercede with Ninib and appease his wrath.

<sup>5</sup> The temple of Enlil in Nippur.

<sup>6</sup> Chapel of Enlil's consort in Ekur.

<sup>7</sup> These three lines are inserted in honour of temples in the cities of Kiš and Erech. The foregoing temples and shrines were all in Nippur, the sanctuary of Ninib's father.

<sup>8</sup> The conclave of gods on the mythological mountain adore the son after his victory.

In copying from the older tablet the redactor skilfully leaves out lines which were characteristic of the father Enlil. Thus lines 21-25 referring to the 'word' of Enlil, his universal lordship and care for the earth are omitted, since the theologians, however much attached to the father-son idea, never ventured to think of Enlil apart from his fatherhood of the gods and his special care of the earth.

The linguistic peculiarities of the redaction need not arrest our attention here. To make the method of literary composition entirely clear, a philological commentary would be necessary. We believe, however, that the above popular treatment will serve to throw some light upon the literary methods of Babylonian temple schools, and upon some of those gnostic and mystic ideas which formed their philosophy.

## The Great Text Commentary.

### THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. LUKE.

LUKE XIX. 41, 42.

**'And when he drew nigh, he saw the city and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes.'**—R.V.

#### EXPOSITION.

**'And when he drew nigh, he saw the city.'**—Tradition, assuming that our Lord took the direct road over the summit of the Mount of Olives, points out the spot as half-way down the western slope. But there is no doubt that the road by which Jesus went is that which goes over the southern shoulder, between the peak where the Tombs of the Prophets are and that called the Mount of Offence. 'After the first view of the south-eastern corner of the city . . . the road descends a slight declivity, and the glimpse of the city is again withdrawn behind the intervening ridge of Olivet. A few moments, and the path mounts again; it climbs a rugged ascent, it reaches a ledge of smooth rock, and in an instant the whole city bursts into view. . . . Immediately below was the Valley of the Kedron, here seen in its greatest depth as it joins the Valley of Hinnom, and thus giving full effect to the great peculiarity of Jerusalem seen only on its eastern side—its situation as of a city rising out of a deep abyss. It is hardly possible to doubt that this rise and turn of the road, this rocky ledge, was the exact point where the multitude paused again, and "He, when he beheld the city, wept over it."—STANLEY.

**'And wept over it.'**—Not merely 'shed silent tears' (*ἐδάκρυσεν*), as at the grave of Lazarus (Jn 11<sup>35</sup>), but 'wept aloud' (*ἐκλαύσεν*), and that although not all the agonies and insults of four days later could wring from Him one tear or sigh.—FARRAR.

**'Saying, if thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace!'**—This is probably correct, but the text is somewhat uncertain. The aposiopesis is impressive. In the expression of strong emotion sentences are often broken. The words imply that there have been various opportunities, of which this is the last.

Thus once more ('how often,' Lk 13<sup>34</sup>) the Synoptic narrative is found to imply the Judean ministry recorded by John. The *kai oú* perhaps implies no comparison: 'even thou' (A.V. and R.V.). But if 'thou also' (Rhem.) be preferred, it probably means, 'as well as my disciples.' The protasis 'If thou hadst known' does not imply any such definite apodosis as 'Thou wouldest weep,' etc. The expression is virtually a wish, 'Oh, that thou hadst known.'—PLUMMER.

**'Which belong unto peace!'**—Perhaps with a *paronomasia* on the name of *Salem* or 'Peace,' and on the *sound* though not the derivation of Jerusalem (Yeroo Shalom, 'they shall see peace'; cf. Ps 122<sup>6, 7</sup>). Such plays on words often spring from deep emotion.—FARRAR.

#### THE SERMON.

##### Christ wailing over Jerusalem.

*By the very Rev. F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S.*

1. Jesus was driven from Jerusalem by the enmity of the priests, and compelled to take refuge in Ephraim. There He remained 'until He saw the crowds of pilgrims from Galilee making their way to keep the Passover at Jerusalem, and these He joined, knowing that with them He might make, what He well knew would be His last journey, in safety. He wended His way up the Mount of Olives surrounded by the shouting, triumphant crowd, and suddenly the view of the city burst upon them, and the crowd stood still, expectant probably of a promise of glorious emancipation. But instead of that a rush of anguish filled Christ's soul, and He 'wailed aloud.'

2. Why did He 'wail'—the only time this strongest word is used about Christ? Was not



Jerusalem a most religious city, with its Temple laden with gold, and its 40,000 priests, and endless army of white-robed Levites? Were not 2,000,000 pilgrims making their way to Jerusalem at this very time? But the Lord looked beneath the surface and saw that their religion was a hollow pretence. They were careful about the washing of the platter, but their hearts were unclean, and they were about to commit the most awful sin that the world has ever seen. So the doom of ruin was passed upon them, and it was fulfilled within the lifetime of some of those who heard it. Their city was taken, and men slaughtered, till it became an unrecognizable heap of mounded graves.

3. This incident is an allegory. The soul of each one amongst us is such a Jerusalem. The soul has its history of shame or of faithfulness, and its prophecy of triumph or of doom, just as Jerusalem had. Jerusalem had warnings. And have not we had warnings in the sight of the thousands of men and women who have ruined their lives? The doom which fell upon Jerusalem was not more terrific than that which falls upon guilty men. To them Christ is saying, 'If thou hadst known . . . the things that belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid.' *'But now.'* In the words of an old divine, 'Though this day be like yesterday, and to-morrow like to-day, yet one day will come for all, and then woe, woe, woe, and nothing but darkness. Though the fire fell not upon Sodom till evening, yet it fell; and so comes the Judge, though He be not yet come; though He hath leaden feet, He hath iron hands.' When the terrible 'too late' has been pronounced, 'all the furies of Hell leap upon the self-ruined soul. . . . Irons are laid upon his body like a prisoner, all his lights are put out at once.' Jerusalem found that it was so, and so shall all men who persist in defying the mercy of God which calleth us to repentance.

4. The wail of Christ over Jerusalem has a solemn reminder for us. It is not yet too late for us to listen to the voice of Christ, but the sun is speedily setting, and none knows how soon for us the night may fall. We neglect the warnings of Scripture, and while we defy its exhortations we clutch at its promises. We are like men who see a river before them and plunge into it hoping we may find footing, and so are drowned. We see wrath written against our way of life and

hope it may not be wrath but forgiveness. But when we think of the fate of God's once glorious Temple, and of God's once chosen people, let us not be high-minded but fear! Let us wrestle, and watch, and pray!

### The Things that alone count.

*By Professor the Rev. Hugh Black, M.A.*

The Saviour's tears were a startling contrast to the exultant shouts of the Triumphal Entry. The disciples' hearts were glad at the signs of their Master's acceptance. What they expected they hardly knew, but certainly a triumph for Christ, and salvation for Israel. As they rounded the hill and Jerusalem came in sight, a hush fell on them, for the Lord was weeping. What did He see in the city? The long story of God's love and patience—and its failure! He knew that He had been rejected by rulers and people, and that He had lived, and would die, in vain, so far as that hard and proud city was concerned. They were blind, as their fathers had been, to all the mercy and loving-kindness of God. The Redeemer knew that His way in that city was the way of the cross. He knew that the city was doomed. They had had their day of visitation, and were still having it. But they were throwing away their last chance, following false lights, dreaming false hopes, and seeking false sources of peace.

We see clearly that it was their day of visitation, when they might have laid deep the foundations of a strong national life. Jesus showed them that sin was the one weakness of a nation, and the one bondage of man. But their political ideas never went further than the throwing off the yoke of Rome, and their religious ideas were similar—external in aim—looking for the kingdom of God in the form of a Jewish world-empire. He taught 'the kingdom of God is within you,' but they rejected His teaching, and rejected Himself, and did not know they were refusing their only hope. Our Lord's lament was the same as that of the prophet of old, 'Oh, that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments, then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea.' If they had only known that their day of grace was almost gone.

*If we knew!* We too have a day of grace. There are things that belong to our peace, and the same things as ever. What of all the things

we do and seek can be put in this class as essential to our real welfare? Apart from sinful pleasures and evil ambitions, what about the pursuits we count innocent and spend our strength and desire on? The question that ought to be asked is not, are they innocent, but are they *sufficient*? Success is good, a happy home is good, knowledge is good, business energy is good, but who would say that any of these external things—which the world can give or take—is a sufficient end for a human soul? If our purposes and pursuits are stripped from us and leave us naked before death and the judgment—if we have no life of the soul and no citizenship in heaven—then the Saviour may well weep over us as He wept over the Jews.

If we had known! But we do know, and we should know. The Lord summons us now to a new life with other ambitions and hopes, and if we go with Him we will not at the last be tortured with vain desires and vain regrets.

#### ILLUSTRATIONS.

**And as he came near, seeing the city he wept over it.**—After the capture of Rome in 1870, Mazzini recognized that his ideal was shattered. His own party had failed him. 'Italy, my Italy,' he said; 'the Italy I have preached, the Italy of our dreams! Italy, the great, the beautiful, the moral Italy of my heart! I thought to call up the soul of Italy, and I only see its corpse.' 'Yes,' he writes to Mrs. Stansfeld, 'I love more deeply than I thought my poor dreamt-of Italy, my old vision of Savona. I want to see before dying, another Italy, the ideal of my soul and life, start up from her three hundred years' grave: this is only the phantom, the mockery of Italy. And the thought haunts me, like the incomplete man in Frankenstein seeking for a soul from its maker.'

Two years later, in March 1872, he died, and Carducci's epitaph describes him as—

The man who sacrificed all,  
Who loved greatly,  
Who sympathized deeply,  
And hated not at all.

BOLTON KING'S *Mazzini*, p. 218.

No one can walk among the stately ruins of Tintern Abbey without being deeply moved. The skeleton windows and broken buttresses and columns are so suggestive of the splendour that once was and that could have been preserved if proper care had been taken. But supposing the architect—the man whose skill and industry raised the fabric—could see it, he would be the one who would weep most bitterly over the ruins, for the simple reason that he would know,

like no one else, the contrast between what is and what might have been.

Tears from the depth of some divine despair  
Rise in the heart, and gather to the eyes,  
In thinking of the days that are no more.

Even so Christ wept over Jerusalem when other eyes were dry. He alone saw the unrealized possibilities—the moral and spiritual ruins. Exalted to heaven with privileges, it had disappointed every expectation, and as a result was fast moving to complete destruction. Seeing all this, no wonder Jesus wept.

For of all sad words of tongue or pen,  
The saddest are these: 'It might have been.'

**A vision of the city.**—The Church needs a vision of the city. Dr. Campbell Morgan relates the following incident. Mrs. Catherine Booth was once present at a meeting in a Yorkshire town with a lady who was entertaining her. Her hostess was a Christian lady, of great refinement, and the member of a Christian Church. When she got on the platform and saw the kind of people that Mrs. Booth had brought together, she said to her, 'How could you bring me here? I am not accustomed to see this sort of crowd.' And Mrs. Booth answered, 'My dear madam, all these are your neighbours. I did not bring them with me here, I have simply brought them out to show you.'

**In this thy day.**—It is a critical point in Reade's story of *Hard Cash* when Noah Skinner the fraudulent banker's clerk, old and dying, proposes to himself and resolves to deliver up, *to-morrow*, the receipt for fourteen thousand pounds, his criminal possession and crafty retention of which has caused such profound and widespread misery. Thus: 'a sleepy languor came over him . . . but his resolution remained unshaken; by and by waking up from a sort of heavy dose, he took, as it were, a last look at the receipt and murmured, 'My head, how heavy it feels.' But presently he roused himself, and murmured again brokenly, 'I'll take it to—Pembroke Street to-mor—row, to-mor—row.' The to-morrow found him and so did the detectives—dead.

**Now they are hid from thine eyes.**—In the *Life and Letters of Darwin* we have a pathetic record of how, through the neglect of his æsthetic tastes and the absorption in the pursuit of purely physical science, the character of the great scientist lost the poise of a true development, and the artistic and spiritual faculties of his soul, on his own confession, atrophied and died. 'Formerly, I was led to the firm conviction of God and of the immortality of the soul. In my journal I wrote that whilst standing in the midst of the grandeur of the Brazilian forest, "It is not possible to give an adequate idea of the higher feelings of wonder, admiration, and devotion which fill and elevate the mind." I well remember my conviction that there is more in man than the mere breath of his body. But now the grandest scene would not cause any such conviction and feeling to rise in my mind. It may be truly said that I am like a man who has become colour blind; and the universal belief by



men of the existence of redness makes my present loss of perception of not the least value as evidence. Disbelief crept over me at a very slow rate, but was at last complete. The rate was so slow that I felt no distress.'

#### FOR REFERENCE.

Armstrong (J.), *Parochial Sermons*, 28.  
 Arnot (W.), *The Anchor of the Soul*, 326.  
 Bamford (A. J.), *Things that are Made*, 99.  
 Belfrage (H.), *Sacramental Addresses*, 172.  
 Black (H.), *Edinburgh Sermons*, 291.  
 Bright (W.), *Law of Faith*, 141.  
 Clayton (J. W.), *The Genius of God*, 120.  
 Farrar (F. W.), *The Silence and Voices of God*, 171.  
 " " *True Religion*, 179.  
 Fraser (J.), *Parochial Sermons*, 40.  
 Hull (E. L.), *Sermons Preached at King's Lynn* (3rd ser.), 181.  
 Hutchings (W. H.), *Sermon Sketches*, ii. 120.  
 Jeffrey (R. T.), *The Salvation of the Gospel*, 330, 384.  
 Keble (J.), *Sermons for the Christian Year—Sundays after Trinity*, i. 353.  
 M'Cheyne (R. M.), *A Basket of Fragments*, 188.

Matheson (G.), *Rests by the River*, 123.  
 Mellor (W.), *Village Homilies*, 127.  
 Price (A. C.), *Fifty Sermons*, vi. 73.  
 Ridgeway (C. J.), *Social Life*, 68.  
 Scott (M.), *Harmony of Collects, Epistles, and Gospels*, 186.  
 Sellar (J. A.), *Church Doctrine and Practice*, 245.  
 Senior (W.), *A Faithful Minister*, 77.  
 Talmage (T. De Witt), *The Masque Torn Off*, 183.  
 Trench (R. C.), *Sermons Preached in Westminster Abbey*, 309.  
 Wilberforce (B.), *Feeling after Him*, 15.  
 Williams (W. W.), *Resources and Responsibilities*, 250.  
 Winterbotham (R.), *Sermons*, 466.  
*Alive unto God, Easter and Lent Sermons*, 19.  
*Christian World Pulpit*, vol. xiv. 251 (J. T. Stannard).  
 " " " vol. xxi. 312 (E. H. Plumptre).  
 " " " vol. lxx. 128 (J. D. Jones).  
*Church Pulpit Year Book* I. (1904), 91.  
 " " " " II. (1905), 218.  
 " " " " IV. (1907), 176.  
 " " " " V. (1908), 242.  
*Sermons for Christian Seasons*, vol. iii. Trinity, 753.  
*Sermons for Sundays, Festivals, and Fasts*, 2nd ser. iii. 96.

## The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

BY PROFESSOR THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LITT., OXFORD.

### Genesis i. 14-30.

**14. The Heavenly Bodies.**—The night had already been distinguished from the day on the first day (v.<sup>5</sup>), but in the Assyrian Epic the heavenly bodies were not set apart to mark the seasons until after the creation of the firmament and the earth with the existing seas, and accordingly the Biblical narrative introduces their creation here on the fourth day, in spite of the inconsistency it involved. The fifth tablet of the Epic begins as follows:—

(Merodach) fashioned the stations of the great gods, he fixed the stars that corresponded with them, called the *lumasi*.

He fixed the year, setting apart the Zodiacal signs; twelve months he defined, each with its three stars, from the day when the year begins to the end.

He founded the station of Jupiter that they might know their laws.

That they might not sin or go astray any one of them, he established the station of Bel and Ea along with it. He opened doors on the two sides (of the house of the sky),

making fast the bolts on the left side and the right.

In its centre he placed the zenith, bidding the Moon-god shine and rule the night.

He made him also a creature of the night to make known the days;

month by month without fail he gave him a crown; at the beginning of the month as it dawns upon the earth the horns shine to make known the seasons: on the seventh day the crown he . . .

The heavenly bodies were themselves deities in Babylonian belief, and therefore had existed as long as the creator, Merodach, himself. All the creator could do was to give them laws and make them regulators of time. Their divine character is implicitly denied in the Hebrew narrative which makes God create as well as appoint them to their duties. As, however, it retains the place assigned by the Epic to the appointment in the order of the creation, an inconsistency is occasioned with vv.<sup>3-5</sup>, which shows that the Hebrew writer had before him either the Epic or the materials out of which it was composed. Otherwise the appointment of the heavenly bodies to their duties would have been inserted in its natural place.

**Signs.**—Babylonia was the first home of astrology, and the earliest astronomical observations

made there were for the purpose of discovering of what events the movements of the heavenly bodies were 'signs.' The great astrological work in seventy-two books, which was ascribed to Bel, and was translated into Greek by Berossus, went back to the early days of Semitic supremacy in the country. Hence in enumerating the objects for which the heavenly bodies were appointed, the first object the Babylonian would have mentioned would have been that they were for 'signs.' The fact that in the Epic no direct reference is made to this, may indicate that it was not the Epic, but an earlier cosmological poem which lay before the Hebrew writer. The Hebrew **אֵתָּה**, *et*, is borrowed from the Babylonian technical term *ittu*, which is derived from *âtû*, 'to see.' **מִיָּעַר** is another early example of Babylonian influence, the verb *יער*, from which it is formed, being the Assyrian *wâddi*, which is used in the technical sense of 'fixing' a season, as in the passage quoted above from the Epic, where 'he fixed the year' is *wâddi satta*. According to Zimmern, **מִיָּעַר** is equivalent to the Assyrian *adanni*. Like astrology, the calendar of Western Asia also owed its origin to the Babylonians.

**16.** A reminiscence of Babylonian polytheism has been allowed to remain in this verse, the sun and moon being said to 'rule over' the day and night. Similarly, in the Epic, Merodach is stated to have appointed the Moon-god to 'rule the night.' As Merodach was himself the Sun-god, he was not able to do the same in the case of the sun; but in the older Babylonian cosmologies, in which the creator was either Ea or Bel of Nippur, the sun, as well as the moon, was doubtless appointed to his work.

It is noticeable that the names of the 'sun' and 'moon' are avoided, since these were also names of deities. For the same reason none of the stars is specified, not even the evening-star, which, as Istar, occupied among the Babylonians an equal place in the heavens with the sun and moon. In the eyes of the Biblical writer they were all 'lights,' not deities, and were 'made' by God. The Babylonian order of succession, however, is followed, the sun preceding the moon, although among the Hebrews the year was lunar, and time was counted from evening to evening. See note on v.<sup>5</sup>.

**17.** 'To give light.' This verse is incompatible with the statement that light had been created on

the first day. But it closely follows the order of events as given in the Epic, where the stars are first appointed to mark the seasons, and the Moon-god is then bidden to 'shine and rule the night.'

**18.** 'Day and night' instead of 'night and day,' again, refers us to Babylonia and the solar year. The division between light and darkness had already been made on the first day, according to v.<sup>4</sup>.

**20.** **שֶׁרֶץ**, *sherez*, corresponds with the Assyrian *nammastu* (which may be the Heb. **רֶמֶשׂ**, *remes*), **נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה**, *nephesh hayyâh*, with *siknat napisti*. The portion of the Assyrian Epic which described the creation of the animals has not yet been recovered. In the Sumerian poem there is no reference to the fish and birds.

**21.** The firmament and the heavenly bodies which were divinities and the results of evolution in the Babylonian system were, it will be observed, 'made'; the fish and birds were 'created.'

**22. The Blessing** is taken from that pronounced upon man in v.<sup>28</sup>. No blessing is pronounced upon the land animals, since they were included in the creation of man. In the sixth tablet of the Assyrian Epic (where Ea, it must be remembered, and not Merodach, was originally the creator) man was similarly blessed and instructed in the path that he should follow. He had been created, it is said, in order to worship the gods, to build temples in their honour and offer them the sacrifices they required.<sup>1</sup> It is probable that the lower animals had been created for much the same purpose—that the altar of the gods might never be without its victim.

**23. The Seas** only are mentioned, and not the rivers also, as would have been the case in Babylonia, since in Palestine the rivers were mere summer torrents which were not fished. For another indication that the chapter was written in Palestine, see v.<sup>11</sup>.

**24.** That the earth should be said to have brought forth the lower animals, as it had brought forth the seed-bearing plants, is a reminiscence of

<sup>1</sup> The actual words of Merodach are (in Mr. King's translation):

'My blood will I take, and bone will I [fashion],

I will make man, that man may . . .

I will create man who shall inhabit [the earth],

That the service of the gods may be established and [that] their shrines [may be built].'

Here the Assyrian *amelu* corresponds with the Heb. *adam*.



polytheism, and must be due to its having formed too integral a part of the Assyro-Babylonian prototype to be disregarded. But it is instantly corrected in the next verse, where the animals are stated to have been 'made'—not 'created'—by God, like the firmament and the heavenly bodies. The Earth-goddess was known to the Babylonians just as she was to the peoples of Asia Minor, and all living things were believed to have 'come forth' from her bosom. At Eridu she was called Damkina, 'the lady of the earth,' and was made the mother and wife of the demiurge Ea; elsewhere she was identified with Gula, or Istar, who had 'borne' mankind. She appears in the Sumerian cosmological poem under the name of Aruru, who is said to have 'made the seed of mankind' along with the demiurge, mankind being here regarded as sprung from the seed in the soil like the plants. In the Khammu-rabi age the name of the goddess Irtsitum, or the Earth, enters into the composition of a good many West Semitic names, indicating that she was extensively worshipped. The phrase *הִיְתוֹ-אֶרֶץ*, which is shown by the retention of the case suffix to be an old one, must go back to this period, *Erez* being employed in it as a proper name without the article, like *Tehom* in v.<sup>2</sup>. The Babylonian equivalent would be *siknat Irtsitim*. With *נֶפֶשׁ הַיָּה*, *nephesh hayyâh*, compare the Babylonian 'seed of life,' *zer napsâti*, which Utu-napisti was commanded to take into the ark. That primitive man should have believed that the animal creation was begotten by the earth-mother was natural; schoolboys still believe that horse-hairs in the puddles of the streets become worms, and the modern Egyptian that rats are born from the Nile mud at the time of the inundation.

25. The reminiscences of the Earth-goddess derived from the older literature are at once suppressed, and the animal creation is declared to have been 'made' by the One God. In place of 'the living soul' that 'sprang from the earth,' we now have 'the beast (*or* living thing) of the earth'; and in place of 'creeping thing and beast of Earth,' we have 'everything that creepeth upon the ground.' The Earth-goddess makes way for the ground that has been created by God and is tilled by man.

26. **Man.**—In all the Babylonian cosmologies the creation of man is the final act and object of the creator. It was in Semitic Babylonia, more-

over, that the gods were first conceived in human form. From the outset, the deities of the Babylonian Semites, in opposition to their Sumerian predecessors, were human; they were represented as men and women, living under a supreme lord, Bel or Baal, whose court resembled that of his vicegerent, the human king, on earth. Like men and women, too, they were born and died, were married and had children, while angel messengers carried their commands from heaven to earth. This conception of the gods in human form involved the converse belief that men were divine; they were, accordingly, held to have been made in the likeness of the gods—with the same physical features, and the same mental and moral attributes—and the king himself was deified.

The words *אִדָּם*, '*âdham*, 'man,' and *צֶלֶם*, '*zelem*, 'image,' are both of Babylonian derivation. The Babylonians were skilled sculptors from an early period; their temples and palaces were adorned with the images of the gods and men, and the kings caused images of themselves to be carved on the rocks of conquered countries. The images of the gods which were made in the likeness of men were familiar to their eyes. *דְּמוּת*, *dēmûth*, 'likeness,' is the West Semitic translation of the Babylonian *צֶלֶם*, *zelem*, 'image,' and must originate in a gloss similar to the glosses which we find in the Tel el-Amarna tablets where the Canaanite or Hebrew equivalent is added to a Babylonian word. The upright wedge in the cuneiform, which serves to denote the equivalence, is here replaced by *כֹּ* ('after'). We here, therefore, have an indication of a translation from a cuneiform original, which explains the pronoun 'our.' This is incompatible with the strict monotheism of the Hebrew writer, and the retention of such a relic of Babylonian polytheism can only be due to his quoting, when he came to the creation of man, the exact words of the Babylonian prototype. His wish to retain these may have resulted from the use of the word *adam* for 'man,' the employment of which in the description of the creation was too firmly fixed in literature to be displaced. The first 'man' was the Babylonian *adamu* (used for both singular and plural), not the West Semitic '*ish*.'

The fish and birds come first in the enumeration, as they had been created first. 'Over the cattle and over all the earth' must be corrected into 'cattle and beast of the earth,' corresponding with

the Babylonian *bul tsiri* [*umam*] *tsiri*, 'cattle of the field (and) beast of the field,' which we find in a cosmological fragment (*D. T.* 41. 4). The polytheistic expression *חֵית־אֶרֶץ* was a good reason for changing the text.

27. Man is both 'made' and 'created.' The distinction between *בָּרָא*, *bārâ*, and *עָשָׂה*, *ʿasâh*, corresponds with the distinction between the Assyrian *bânû* and *epîsu*, both of which are similarly used in the Semitic translation of the Sumerian poem of the Creation. The idea of 'begetting' like a father is associated with *bârâ* and *bânû*. Man is thus 'hewn out' into the image of God.

The latter part of the verse is a translation of the Assyrian: *ana tsalam ilâni ibnî-su; zikri u zinnisti*

*ibnî-sunu*, and presupposes a metrical Assyro-Babylonian original.

28. The polytheistic *חֵית־אֶרֶץ* has been dropped out of the text, so that the enumeration is incomplete, 'the cattle of the field' not being included within the rule of man. The Septuagint has preserved the original text.

30. The words, 'every green herb for food,' have no construction. But they are a translation (or transliteration) of an Assyrian *kal urgit isbi ana akali*, of which we have the Hebrew paraphrase in v.<sup>29</sup>. They must have slipped into the Hebrew manuscript unintentionally. In the Sumerian poem of the Creation *urgit isbi* is replaced by *urgit tserim*, 'the green herb of the field.'

## The Discovery of the Gospel of Barnabas.

BY THE REV. JOHN W. YOUNGSON, D.D., OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND MISSION TO MUSLIMS.

THE appearance of the Italian copy of the so-called Gospel of Barnabas, after a seclusion of two hundred years' duration, requires a word of explanation, without which there would remain an omission in the known history of the MS., and a consciousness in the minds of those who are interested in it, that, at all events, the story of its recent discovery was wanting. Let me give my quota of information regarding this, in the hope that more with respect to the writing generally may be elicited. As a missionary to Mohammedans I write from the missionary's point of view, and with a missionary's concern. To one in the mission field the story has a romantic cast, and although it is not of immediate practical value, yet it completes history as far as we know it, and is, therefore, noteworthy.

In discussions with Mohammedans frequent mention is made of the Gospel of Barnabas, which they do not scruple to accuse us of wilfully keeping from them. In India, in Persia, as missionaries preach the gospel, the cry of the Mohammedans is, 'Where is the Gospel of Barnabas?' We have wished that we could answer the question, and nine years ago, believing that, if it were found, it would prove an important witness, willing or unwilling, to the truth, we set about searching for it in order to put, if possible, an end to all uncertainty regarding it.

The notices of its contents of which we were already in possession were certainly few, but they were important, for writers on Mohammedanism, in their quotations from it, selected those very portions in which the Divine nature and Messiahship of Jesus, the Christ, and the reality of His crucifixion, were denied. There was a fear that the Mohammedans, if put in possession of the whole book, would use it as a weapon against the Christian faith; on the other hand, so copious were the quotations from it, that we thought more harm could not be done by the publication of the complete work than had already been done by them, but rather that it might lead further to the discovery of the book's inconsistency with itself and with the Qoran. It could hardly fail to discover its true character, and be convicted of error and also of intentional fraud. With this expectation the search for it was made, and it would be nothing less than a calamity if the hope were disappointed.

What did we know of the book then? And let us remember that the Muslims knew just as much as we did, and no more.

*First.* Dr. White, in his Bampton Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford in 1784, tells us that 'by the obliging communication of the Rev. Dr. Monkhouse, of Queen's College, who



had in his possession an ancient MS. containing the whole Spanish version, and also a translation of a considerable part of the work into literal English, he was enabled to give his readers some specimens of this audacious forgery, and of the manner in which the gospel history had been corrupted, so as to accommodate it to the interests and assertions of the Qoran.' He quotes freely from it, prefacing his quotations with these words: 'As the representation which it gives, though false and absurd, is yet novel and curious, I make no apology to my readers for quoting it at large.' And he boldly quotes the passages in which Jesus denies that He is the Messiah, and an account is given of how Jesus was carried to heaven alive, and Judas Iscariot was crucified in His stead.

*Second.* Sale, in the preliminary discourse to his translation of the Qoran, 1734, affirms the existence of 'a Gospel in Arabic attributed to St. Barnabas,' and declares that 'of this Gospel the Moriscoes in Africa have a translation in Spanish; and there is in the library of Prince Eugene of Savoy a manuscript of some antiquity containing an Italian translation of the same Gospel, made, it is supposed, for the use of renegades.' This information he had from Mr. Toland's *Nazarenus*.

In his Preface also he mentions that the Gospel of Barnabas in Spanish was lent to him by the Rev. Dr. Holme, Rector of Hedley, in Hampshire. This Spanish version was set forth 'in the front,' to have been made from the Italian by an Arragonian Muslim, named Mustafa de Aranda.

*Third.* Toland, in his *Nazarenus*, 1718, asserts that he had the good fortune to light on it, 'translated into Italian, by or for the use of some renegades.' It was given to him by 'Mr. Cramer, Counsellor to the King of Prussia, but residing at Amsterdam, who had it out of the library of a person of great name and authority in the said city.' Mr. Toland brought it from Amsterdam, and gave it to Prince Eugene of Savoy. He describes its style, and gives an example, with the remark, 'the Scripture-stile to a hair.' He describes also the paper, the ink, the orthography, and conjectures the age of the writing. He mentions the Arabic notes, 'in transverse lines on the margin,' the number of chapters with headings, and so on. In his *Tetradymus* (*Mangoneutes*) also, and elsewhere, he discusses it as a possible Gospel, 'remarkably interpolated.' Referring to

the substance of its teaching with regard to the crucifixion, he says: 'How great (by the way) is the ignorance of those who make this an original invention of the Mahometans! for the Basilidians, in the very beginning of Christianity, deny'd that CHRIST himself suffer'd, but that SIMON of Cyrene was crucified in his place. The Cerinthians before them, and the Carpocratians next, did believe the same thing; that it was not himself, but one of his followers very like him, that was crucify'd: so that the Gospel of Barnabas, for all this account, may be as old as the time of the Apostles, bateing several interpolations (from which, 'tis known, that no Gospel is exempt), since Cerinthus was contemporary with Peter, Paul, and John, if there be any truth in *Ecclesiastical history*. Thus Photius tells us, that he read a book entitul'd, *The Journeys of the Apostles*, relating the acts of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, and Paul: and among other things contain'd in the same, this was one, that CHRIST was not crucify'd, but another in his stead, and that therefore he laugh'd at the crucifiers, or those who thought they crucify'd him. Some said it was JUDAS that was executed. This laughing of Jesus at the Jews was also affirm'd by the Basilidians, as you may see in the place I quoted about them just now out of Epiphanius.'<sup>1</sup> With all this the Mohammedans had, they thought, reason to think that there was foundation in some Gospel or other for their own beliefs regarding the person and work of Jesus. To any one who knows something of the evangelization of the Mohammedans it will be apparent how the mention of this Gospel, of which they had extracts, created a desire in us missionaries to produce and interrogate it.

For us, isolated in such countries as India and Persia, with few opportunities of research, the task was uncertain, but what we could not ourselves do we might accomplish otherwise, by the help of friends at home. I knew that my friend, the late Professor Hastie, of Glasgow, was an Italian scholar, and I was sure that, although his work in India had not been especially among Mohammedans, yet he would help us if he could. I explained to him why we sought this book, and aroused his interest somewhat in its importance. He put himself into communication with Sir William Muir, to whom no question affecting

<sup>1</sup> 'Και τον χριστον μη σταυρωθηναι, αλλ' ετερον αντ' αυτου, και καταγελαν δια τουτο των σταυρωντων.'

Mohammedans in the matter of religion was unimportant. Meantime, at Professor Hastie's suggestion, I inquired in India about an Arabic original. The Rev. Dr. Imaduddin, of Amritsar, an Arabic scholar, assured me that he knew of none—'he had never seen it, or seen any one that had seen it.' At that time a pamphlet was issued by one Hamid Snow, giving to the Mohammedan world extracts from this Gospel, which he asserted were translated from the original. I endeavoured to communicate with him, but with no success. My letter may not have reached him—it was never answered or acknowledged. Professor Hastie afterwards wrote that it was now agreed among scholars that there was no original in Arabic.

Time passed, and the matter seemed to have been allowed to drop, when I wrote to inquire if any progress had been made, intimating also that I was about to come home on furlough, and would do my best in the search while at home. Professor Hastie replied that Sir William Muir had been ill, and he himself had been occupied exclusively with his own work. He had learned nothing, except that he had seen the name of the Gospel in a book list of the Imperial Library in Vienna. He had not, he said, verified it.

I lost no time in writing to the librarian of the Imperial Library, who informed me that there was in the library an Italian MS. of the Gospel of Barnabas of two hundred and forty pages. I put before him the importance of the book from a missionary standpoint, and the desirability of having it copied, when he referred me to Dr. Rudolf Beer, the amanuensis in the MS. department, who spared no pains to have the whole MS. copied for me, including the marginal notes in Arabic. Most of the arrangement was made while I was at home on furlough, but the first part of the copy was sent to me in India. That portion with succeeding portions was, by Professor Hastie's advice, sent to the delegates of the Clarendon Press, Oxford, who, also at Professor Hastie's

instance, and by his kind mediation, agreed to undertake the publication of it. The copying and publishing took several years to accomplish. The result is now before the world in the fine volume which was published towards the close of last year—'The Gospel of Barnabas, edited and translated from the Italian MS. in the Imperial Library at Vienna, by LONSDALE and LAURA RAGG'—at the Clarendon Press, Oxford. The work has been prepared with exceeding care and ability, and we owe to the editors most grateful acknowledgments. The aspect of the MS. vividly suggests Toland's day, his mention of having presented it to Prince Eugene of Savoy, his remarks on its texture, age, etc., and the spirit of inquiry then abroad. It has a preface in Latin to Prince Eugene, the red letter marks are as Toland describes them, and so on. I made inquiries after the Spanish version at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, but was informed that the MS. was missing.

I may, in conclusion, express the hope that scholars will endeavour to constrain this Gospel of Barnabas to bear witness to the truth. Even when little was known of it, that little was being subjected to intelligent criticism, not only by men at home like Sale, but even by men in India who had been Mohammedans and were now Christians, with the result that its inconsistency with itself and with the Qoran was exposed. Much more, now that the whole is known, may we expect that the publication of the book will be the means of exploding Mohammedan errors, and establishing the truth of the Christian records. As we say in India, *sāñch ko dūch nahīn*, 'the truth cannot be injured.' The Mohammedan problem is becoming more and more pressing. The people of India and Persia are bent on the solution of religious questions, and we cannot believe that their minds and hearts will be much longer cramped within the narrow limits of the Qoran and crude Mohammedan tradition.

\* \* I have placed the copy of the Vienna MS. in the library of King's College, Aberdeen.



## Literature.

### SERMONS IN SYNTAX.

SERMONS IN SYNTAX. By the Rev. John Adams, B.D. (*T. & T. Clark.* 4s. 6d. net.)

MR. ADAMS deserves recognition as a diligent student of the Hebrew Bible in a quiet country parish. He tells us that he has a Commentary in view, and we wish him much success in the attempt. It would be a mistake to regard his present work as an exhaustive treatise on syntax. If that were its avowed character, we should regard it as slight and inadequate. But the author's object is to find 'Sermons in Syntax.' Like a pioneer workman, he pursues his way, erecting here and there on the field of study finger-posts to point the ordinary preacher to an exact and fruitful treatment of Scripture themes.

All we are entitled to ask, therefore, is whether he pursues a sound method, and provides mental stimulus. And the answer must be a strong affirmative. His work is at once scholarly and illuminating. If the ordinary preacher were to imitate Mr. Adams's industry in his study, keeping his mind in close contact with the thought of the original writer by a minute examination of tense, mood, and accent, his mutual powers would be so quickened that he could speak the Word of God with authority. There would be no need to go far afield for matter to preach. The mind, saturated by the Word, would respond to every call, and yield its treasures like an ever-springing fountain.

As an illustration of Mr. Adams's method, we may take Is 58<sup>10</sup> (R.V.): 'If thou draw out thy soul to the hungry, and satisfy the afflicted soul; then shall thy light rise in darkness, and thine obscurity be as the noonday.' Our author, looking narrowly at the points and moods, translates the initial verb as a pure subjunctive, then begins the apodosis with the second clause, preserving the verb as an ordinary future: 'If thou *furnish* thy bread for the hungry, then *shalt thou satisfy* the afflicted soul, and (as for thyself) thy light *shall arise* in darkness, and thine obscurity be as the noonday," i.e. a *voluntary duty* and a *twofold reward*. In short, a blessing pronounced on him who considereth the poor—(1) because he shall have the satisfaction of knowing that his practical beneficence has brought good to his brother-man,

and (2) because this shall be as the flashing forth of heaven's own light on his own path and problems, for he who is helping to lift the burdens of humanity is helping to remove his own. 'Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.'

ANGUS M. MACDONALD.

*Benholm.*

### LORD ACTON.

1. THE HISTORY OF FREEDOM AND OTHER ESSAYS. By John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, First Baron Acton. (*Macmillan.* 10s. net.)

2. HISTORICAL ESSAYS AND STUDIES. By the Same. (*Macmillan.* 10s. net.)

Is it possible for the uninitiated and the inexperienced to understand Lord Acton? Hitherto it has not been possible. There was nothing to form a judgment upon. With the reputation among the initiated of being the greatest historical scholar of our time, he wrote no great history, and, although it was well enough known that many articles and reviews from his pen were scattered throughout the periodicals, only the expert could discover them, or, coming upon them accidentally, could recognize them to be his. Now, however, some of the most characteristic of his articles have been gathered together, and published in these two fine volumes. It is possible at last to understand and appreciate Lord Acton.

The volumes have been edited by John Neville Figgis, M.A., sometime Lecturer in St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, and Reginald Vere Laurence, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Trinity College, Cambridge. And it may be well to say at once that the editors have done their work with excellent judgment. It is but rarely that a man's periodical contributions are worth republishing after his death. But Lord Acton, more than any man we can think of, unless perhaps Professor Hort, wrote to a periodical as if he expected it to live and be read for ever. The essays which these volumes contain will not only make intelligible the adoration of Lord Acton's associates and contemporaries, but they will be cherished by the generations to come for their completeness and finality,—for the completeness of the investigation which Lord Acton gave to the

topic upon which he intended to write, however short an article; and for the finality of the judgment which he does not hesitate to pronounce upon the matter with which that short article deals, however momentous a matter it may be.

To the volume entitled *The History of Freedom* the editors have contributed an Introduction. They are conscious that to most people Lord Acton is still an enigma, to some a misapprehension. Their purpose is to remove the misapprehension and, if possible, to clear up the enigma. A subordinate purpose is also evident—to introduce the reader to the essays. Now the commonest form which the misapprehension takes is to look upon Lord Acton as simply a bookworm. He could not write, it is supposed, because he could not stop reading. That misapprehension will partly be removed by the mere titles of the essays which have been gathered into these volumes. But the editors deliberately state that ‘he had none of the pedant’s contempt for ordinary life, none of the æsthete’s contempt for action as a “little vulgar,” and no desire to make of intellectual pursuits an end in themselves.’ Lord Acton was a man of faith. That is why he could not make of intellectual pursuits an end in themselves. It was the intense reality of his faith that made his scholarship practical, his politics ethical, and his whole life a unity. And then, when they have said this, the editors, in one golden sentence, reveal the secret of Lord Acton’s life. All his various interests, they say, ‘were inspired by one unconquered resolve, the aim of securing universally, alike in Church and in State, the recognition of the paramountcy of principles over interests, of liberty over tyranny, of truth over all forms of evasion or equivocation.’ On another page they put the same thing in another way. They say ‘his one belief was the right of every one not to have, but to be, his best.’

One of the articles in the same volume in which the editors’ introduction appears is on the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. It was contributed to the *North British Review* as long ago as October 1869. It is an article of extraordinary interest, and it illustrates Lord Acton’s style of writing so admirably that we shall confine our attention at present to it.

The first paragraph mentions the authorities upon which the writer relies. They are, of course, first-hand authorities, every one. But, besides that,

many of them are used now for the first time, being discoveries of the writer’s own. The impression which the paragraph makes, and that without the least suspicion of vanity, is that there is not a scrap of evidence worth looking at on this vast subject which has not been carefully examined. A few paragraphs are next written for the purpose of putting the reader in touch with the situation. The question is then raised whether the massacre was premeditated or not. And the statement is made that ‘the best authorities of the present day are nearly unanimous in rejecting premeditation.’

We take it as settled, then, that the massacre of St. Bartholomew was the sudden irrational act of the king, driven desperate by divisions within his kingdom, and especially by the ascendancy of Coligny which threatened to deprive him of his power. This is the opinion of ‘the best authorities.’ Is it not an opinion likely to commend itself to a loyal Roman Catholic like Lord Acton?

Lord Acton begins the next paragraph with the quiet words, ‘The evidence on the opposite side is stronger than they suppose.’ And from that moment the evidence that the massacre of St. Bartholomew was a deliberate act of the king of France and his advisers, meditated upon for two years, and prepared for with diabolical cleverness and perseverance, is poured in upon the reader until he is overwhelmed with it. Let ‘the best authorities’ say what they will, this is the judgment that will stand.

Does Lord Acton, then, being a Roman Catholic, shield the Church? He thinks that there is no evidence that the Pope was a party to the plot; he thinks that, with two exceptions, there is no evidence that the French clergy had a share in the massacre. He therefore holds that the story of the priests marking with a white cross the doomed dwellings was an invention. But he does not spare the Church. If the Pope was not privy to the plot, he exulted in the execution of it, and the history of his exultation was never told with more severity. If the Pope was guiltless beforehand, the cardinals were guilty throughout, steeped, every one of them, in guilt, bespattered with the blood of innocent women and children before a sword had been lifted.

We have said that only two of the priests are known to have had a share in the massacre. One of them was the king’s preacher, Sorbin. ‘Sorbin,’ says Acton, ‘is the only priest of the capital who is



distinctly associated with the act of the Government. It was his opinion that God has ordained that no mercy shall be shown to heretics, that Charles was bound in conscience to do what he did, and that leniency would have been as censurable in his case as precipitation was in that of Theodosius. What the Calvinists called perfidy and cruelty seemed to him nothing but generosity and kindness. These were the sentiments of the man from whose hand Charles IX. received the last consolations of his religion. It has been related that he was tortured in his last moments with remorse for the blood he had shed. His spiritual adviser was fitted to dispel such scruples. He tells us that he heard the last confession of the dying King, and that his most grievous sorrow was that he left the work unfinished. In all that blood-stained history there is nothing more tragic than the scene in which the last words preparing the soul for judgment were spoken by such a confessor as Sorbin to such a penitent as Charles.'

We must notice, however, though it does not relieve the horror of the situation, that Lord Acton does not attribute the massacre of St. Bartholomew to religious fanaticism. He holds that it was the act of an absolute government fearful of its own safety. And, in order to show how little religion had to do with it, he reminds us that Catherine recommended Elizabeth to do to the Catholics of England what she herself had done to the Protestants of France, promising that if they were destroyed there would be no loss of her goodwill. He even quotes, in proof of the levity of Catherine's religious feelings, the message which she sent to the Duke of Alva, the most blasphemous message surely that a messenger ever carried. 'I must give you,' she said, 'the answer of Christ to the disciples of St. John, "Ite et nuntiate quae vidistis et audivistis; caeci vident, claudi ambulant, leprosi mundantur." And she added, "Beatus qui non fuerit in me scandalizatus."'

Is Lord Acton right in this? Is it possible that he has been influenced, not by his churchmanship, but by his passion for liberty? We may leave the question open.

We pass to the end. There are no apologists for the massacre of St. Bartholomew now. 'A time came,' says Lord Acton, 'when the Catholics, having long relied on force, were compelled to appeal to opinion. That which had been defiantly acknowledged and defended required to be in-

geniously explained away. The same motive which had justified the murder now prompted the lie. Men shrank from the conviction that the rulers and restorers of their Church had been murderers and abettors of murder, and that so much infamy had been coupled with so much zeal. They feared to say that the most monstrous of crimes had been solemnly approved at Rome, lest they should devote the Papacy to the execration of mankind. A swarm of facts were invented to meet the difficulty: The victims were insignificant in number; they were slain for no reason connected with religion; the Pope believed in the existence of the plot; the plot was a reality; the medal is fictitious; the massacre was a feint concerted with the Protestants themselves; the Pope rejoiced only when he heard that it was over. These things were repeated so often that they have been sometimes believed; and men have fallen into this way of speaking whose sincerity was unimpeachable, and who were not shaken in their religion by the errors or the vices of Popes. Möhler was pre-eminently such a man. In his lectures on the history of the Church, which were published only last year, he said that the Catholics, as such, took no part in the massacre; that no cardinal, bishop, or priest shared in the councils that prepared it; that Charles informed the Pope that a conspiracy had been discovered; and that Gregory made his thanksgiving only because the King's life was saved. Such things will cease to be written when men perceive that truth is the only merit that gives dignity and worth to history.'

#### A SCOTS EARL.

A SCOTS EARL IN COVENANTING TIMES:  
Being Life and Times of Archibald, 9th Earl  
of Argyll (1629-1685). By John Willcock,  
B.D., F.R.H.S. (*Andrew Elliot*. 10s.  
net.)

There is no way of writing history that is more charming than the way which Mr. Willcock adopts, of weaving the history of a period round the life of some prominent actor in it. This is the second volume which he has written in that way. The hero of the first volume was the Eighth Earl and only Marquess of Argyll. In the two volumes taken together he has given us an account of the lives of two of the greatest statesmen of Scotland, together with a narrative of public events in that country from the accession of Charles I. to the

Revolution of 1688. It is a period of intense interest and supreme importance.

The present volume covers the Covenanting times. We shall not delay now to speak of the care with which Mr. Willcock gathers the facts for his history. It is enough to point out that his hatred of every misrepresentation of historical fact compels him to use strong language regarding Sir Walter Scott's well-known lapse in *Old Mortality*. We shall quote the passage, as it will give us the opportunity of showing that Mr. Willcock has two other essential characteristics of the historian—natural ease of language and reticence in regard to things sacred. 'Many of our readers,' he says, 'will probably have derived all they know of the Battle of Drumclog from Scott's *Old Mortality*. We should like to point out that the narrative of it there, though brilliant in the extreme, contains one instance of deliberate falsification of history. Claverhouse, as we have said, sent an officer with a flag to demand a parley before the fight began; but there is no evidence that the envoy was, as stated in the novel, treacherously shot while thus engaged. To attribute, as Scott does to Balfour of Burley, an historical personage, such an atrocious crime without any foundation in fact is utterly shameful. Romancers have, of course, to be allowed certain freedom when they weave together fact and imagination in historical novels, but they are still subject to the code which forbids bearing false witness against one's neighbour. For our own part, we frankly confess a strong distaste for this particular novel, though it is one of the most vivid and wonderful of the series in which it appears, not only because of the kind of fault to which we have just alluded, but also because of the use made in it of Holy Writ. To search the Scriptures to find passages to be put into the mouths of Covenanters, and to be used by them in a grotesque manner, is closely akin to profanity, and at times the results of the misdirected labour form rather painful reading.'

Throughout the volume we follow the fortunes of Argyll with steadily rising interest. We do not need Mr. Willcock's summing up of his character and accomplishments at the end. Mr. Willcock himself has given us materials for an estimate, and compelled us to make the estimate for ourselves. But what is more surprising, he has never let the figure of Argyll dwarf the personality of other statesmen. We hear less of Lauderdale, of

Monmouth, of Shaftesbury, but we do not think less of them. Even Claverhouse himself receives all the honour he merits. Mr. Willcock has refused to follow the fashion of canonizing the famous harrier of conventicles; but he has been strict with himself, and has let no early impressions prejudice the estimate which it is the duty of the impartial historian to arrive at.

And this brings us to the most striking and most welcome feature of the book. Mr. Willcock believes in the difference between right and wrong. If he is careful to do justice to those with whom he is naturally out of sympathy, he is just as careful to point out that a man will be judged by his deeds, and that in the most perplexed period of national history it is possible for a statesman to know the right and to do it. He that willeth to do the will of God shall always know of the truth. He ends his book, as we shall end our notice of it, with the stirring lines of Morris, taken from *The Story of Sigurd the Volsung* (1877), p. 163, which contains the warning words of Brinhild, 'the fairest of earth and the wisest of the wise'—

When thou hearest the fool rejoicing, and he saith, 'It is over and past,  
And the wrong was better than right, and hate turns into love at the last,  
And we strove for nothing at all, and the Gods are fallen asleep,  
For so good is the world a-growing that the evil good shall reap:'  
Then loosen thy sword in the scabbard and settle the helm on thine head,  
For men betrayed are mighty, and great are the wrongfully dead.

### OUTLINES OF CHURCH HISTORY.

OUTLINES OF CHURCH HISTORY. By Hans von Schubert. (*Williams & Norgate.* 10s. 6d. net.)

This is the most recent volume of the Theological Translation Library. Dr. von Schubert, who is now Professor Ordinarius of Church History at Heidelberg, when he was in Kiel delivered a course of lectures to which he gave the title of *Grundzüge der Kirchengeschichte*. This was in the winter of 1896. He afterwards enlarged and redelivered the course, and then published the volume in 1903. It reached a third edition in 1906. And it is from this third and improved edition that the English translation has been made. The translator is Mr. Maurice A. Canney, M.A.



Now we believe that very few of the volumes of the Theological Translation Library have had the welcome which this volume is likely to receive. It meets one of our most immediate and imperative needs. Many Church histories have been published recently; but no sketch of the whole course of the history of the Church within the compass of one volume has been published. Nearly all our Church histories are written for students. This is written for the layman.

Then von Schubert is a historian, not a mere analyst. Careful of his facts, he is equally careful of his principles. He believes in an orderly development in the history of the Church, or rather in a Presence throughout that history, much hindered at times by ignorance and self-seeking, but never wholly quenched; often, indeed, turning the wrath of man into the praise of God. He believes that that Presence has been with the Church always, and will be with her till the end comes, and the victory. Thus, without any theory into which the events of Church history must be fitted, he is nevertheless able to relate one event to another and to preserve his faith throughout.

Of the style of the writing take this short paragraph as example.

'The Græco-Roman world, in spite of all its glitter and glory, is forced to receive the gift of the gospel from what the bitter anti-Semite Tacitus has called the *taterrima gens*, from the "foulest nation" within the wide compass of the Roman Empire, from the Jews in the remote Syrian region. These already had the advantage over all other peoples, in being the classical people of religion.'

The English publishers have invited Miss Alice Gardner to add a chapter to von Schubert on 'Religious Thought and Life in England during the Nineteenth Century.' It is a clever sketch. The great movements are recalled, and the small things are dropped out of sight.

#### DR. BULLINGER AND DR. ABBOTT.

HOW TO ENJOY THE BIBLE. By E. W. Bullinger, D.D. (*Eyre & Spottiswoode.* 7s. 6d.)

INDICES TO DIATESSARICA, WITH A SPECIMEN OF RESEARCH. By Edwin A. Abbott. (*A. & C. Black.* 2s. 6d. net.)

Is it the Bible that makes our Theology, or our Theology that makes the Bible? Dr. E. W.

Bullinger and Dr. A. E. Abbott are both students of the Bible, enthusiastic and indefatigable; they are both students of the words of it, which they fondle as a miser fondles his coins; they are both anxious to extract the meaning out of every word of the Bible, the meaning, the whole meaning, and nothing but the meaning. And yet, if we were to range the theologians of the present day into one long line, we should have to place Dr. Bullinger at the extreme end of the line in one direction, and Dr. Abbott at the extreme end in the other. Do we get our theology from the Bible, or do we get the Bible from our theology?

Dr. Bullinger's book is a study of the words of the Bible. In the first place, it has nothing to do with the geography, history, natural history, chronology, or other external things of the Bible. It is a study of the Bible from within. Is it a volume of Higher Criticism, then? No. 'The method of the "Higher" Criticism,' says Dr. Bullinger, 'is to discredit a book or a passage on internal evidence; our method is to establish and accredit Holy Scripture on internal evidence also, and thus to derive and provide, from its own pharmacopœia an antidote to that subtle and malignant poison.'

Let us take an example. Let us take the word *leaven*. There are certain Greek words which have been translated in different senses in the English Bible, and which Dr. Bullinger would restore to one uniform sense. These words are *withhold*, *temptation*, *poor*, *paradise*, *Sheol*, *Hades*, *mystery*, *at hand*, *depart*, and *leaven*. The uniform sense of 'leaven' throughout Scripture, says Dr. Bullinger, is a bad sense. He quotes the passages. And then he asks: 'How can any one dare to use leaven in a sense totally opposite, and interpret it of that which is good in itself, and in its workings and effects?' But what about the Parable? The Parable of the Leaven, says Dr. Bullinger, has nothing whatever to do with the Church, it has to do with the Kingdom. The Kingdom was proclaimed by John the Baptist, by Christ and by Peter; but it was rejected, and has no more place in Scripture. The Kingdom has no place on earth until the present Church-Interval has come to an end. This Church-Interval is a time of corruption. The Parable of the Mustard Seed shows the outward corruption, and the Parable of the Leaven the inward. Is there any confusion here?

Dr. Abbott's new book is entitled *Indices to Diatessarica, with a Specimen of Research* (A. & C. Black; 2s. 6d. net). It is a miracle of cheapness, of industry, of accuracy. Those who possess even one of Dr. Abbott's books must possess this book also; like a true index always, it adds enormously to the value of the book.

What are the books to which this volume is an index? They are 'Clue,' 'Corrections of Mark,' 'From Letter to Spirit,' 'Paradosis,' 'Johannine Vocabulary,' 'Johannine Grammar,' and 'Notes on New Testament Criticism.' In each case the indices include English Greek and Hebrew words, and New Testament passages.

What is the Specimen of Research? It is all about the Well in the Wilderness, that Well about which they sang the Song. It is a gathering and sifting of all that has been said about it by Jew and Christian. It is such a research as reminds one of Dr. J. G. Frazer's manner, who surely must be disappointed that another has been led to make it and not he himself. It is a research packed with good matter for the preacher.

#### DR. BARNARDO.

MEMOIRS OF THE LATE DR. BARNARDO.  
By Mrs. Barnardo and James Marchant.  
(*Hodder & Stoughton.* 12s.)

Dr. Robertson Nicoll contributes an Introduction, and in a few short paragraphs gives us a conception of Dr. Barnardo which remains with us throughout the reading of the whole book, and is confirmed by it. Thus: 'The great apparent characteristic of Dr. Barnardo was ardour. He flamed up into vehemence very easily. Love, pity, wrath, scorn manifested themselves in turn almost volcanically. These bursts soon subsided, but very readily recurred. Dr. Barnardo was a man of strong opinions on many points. Latterly he became somewhat deaf, and was wont to carry a fearful and wonderful instrument which he described as an ear-trumpet. I never saw him use it for the purpose of hearing, but he employed it freely in thumping the back of his companion, whether to enforce the point of a joke or of an argument. He would run round the table pouring himself out, and then as his climax approached he seized his ear-trumpet firmly. But one soon noticed that this great effervescence was not first or last among his qualities. He had that strange tenacity

possessed by a few, to which it seems as if almost everything yields at last.'

Thomas John Barnardo was born in Dublin. His father was of Spanish origin, and that is all we are told about him. His mother belonged to an old Quaker family, the Drinkwaters, who had settled in Ireland. 'She was a woman of great strength of character and deep religious convictions.' That sentence explains the biography.

For it explains Barnardo's rebirth, which took place at the age of sixteen. It was an aftermath of the great Irish revival of 1859-61. The immediate result of it was that Barnardo began to sing. It was understood that until then he had not a note of music in him; but from that time forth he could sing, and lead the praise in large assemblies, and even pick up a music hall tune that was whistled on the street and set it to words with the gospel in them.

'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' He met Hudson Taylor and resolved to go to China. But first, said Hudson Taylor, go to London and learn medicine. He went to London and never left it. His fellow medical students did not understand him. He was enthusiastic enough, persevering too, but made little progress with medicine. At last one of them brought in the news and resolved the mystery. He had seen him preaching on the street.

China called often. But with the rescue of his first waif, China called no more. He began his work in a ragged Sunday School; and that work developed till all the world heard of it under the name of Dr. Barnardo's Homes. He visited public-houses also, and even sang solos on the stage of music halls to open the way for a gospel sermon. No one needs to be told now how the work developed; but the story may be read consecutively in this breezy memoir, and it is a story, scarcely equalled, if at all equalled in our day, of the audacity of faith in God, and the enthusiasm of sympathy for forlorn children. If you wish to preach a sermon on Dr. Barnardo's life take as text that word of Christ, 'Whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it.' Dr. Robertson Nicoll suggests it. And in suggesting it he says that, 'measured by ordinary standards, Dr. Barnardo's life was a very hard one. This man was perhaps the best servant of the empire, but no recognition, no honours came to him.' He died on the 19th of September 1905, at six



o'clock in the evening, leaning back in his chair and passing murmurless away. Then the *Times* published a leading article, and *Punch* this poem—

'Suffer the children unto Me to come,  
The little children,' said the voice of Christ,  
And for his law whose lips to-day are dumb  
The Master's word sufficed.

'Suffer the little children——' so He spake,  
And in His steps that true disciple trod,  
Lifting the helpless ones, for love's pure sake,  
Up to the arms of God.

Naked, he clothed them; hungry, gave them food;  
Homeless and sick, a hearth and healing care;  
Led them from haunts where vice and squalor brood  
To gardens clean and fair.

By birthright pledged to misery, crime, and shame,  
Jetsom of London's streets, her 'waifs and strays,'  
Whom she, the Mother, bore without a name,  
And left, and went her ways—

He stooped to save them, set them by his side,  
Breathed conscious life into the still-born soul,  
Taught truth and honour, love and loyal pride,  
Courage and self-control.

Till of her manhood, here and overseas,  
On whose supporting strength her state is throned,  
None better serves the Motherland than these  
Her sons, the once disowned.

To-day, in what far lands, their eyes are dim,  
Children again, with tears they well may shed,  
Orphaned a second time, who mourn in him  
A foster-father dead!

But he, who had their love for sole reward,  
In that far home to which his feet have won—  
He hears at last the greeting of his Lord:  
'Servant of Mine, well done.'

---

## Among the Books of the Month.

To the question, What must I do to be saved? the answer may be given, in all reverence and confidence, read *The Making of a Christian*, by Professor C. Anderson Scott (Allenson; 1s. 6d.). The book has reached a second edition. It will reach many more editions.

In the year 1841 Theodore Martin and William Edmondstone Aytoun became acquainted, and during the next three years they worked together, turning the *Poems and Ballads of Goethe* into

English (Blackwood; 9s. net). Aytoun and the book seem to belong to the days of our grandfathers. Yet in the end of the year 1907, Sir Theodore Martin edits a new edition of *Poems and Ballads of Goethe*, and writes a vigorous Introduction to it. It is difficult to accept the situation; there is something unearthly about it—'immortal age beside immortal youth.'

The Bishop of Oxford has issued a second edition of his *Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity* (Clarendon Press; 5s. net). The changes made upon the first edition are not numerous, for which Dr. Paget makes a half-hearted apology. He frankly recognizes the value of Mr. Ronald Bayne's edition of the Fifth Book, but he is a Bishop now and he has not had time even to use that. Nevertheless, the book has Dr. Paget's personality behind it, and those at least who have no copy of the first edition, should obtain a copy of the second.

*The Church of Scotland Year-Book for 1908* may be had from Messrs. R. & R. Clark in Edinburgh (6d.).

Another volume has appeared of Messrs. Constable's reliable but cheap series on Ancient and Modern Religion. It is written by Mr. Lewis Spence, and gives an account of *The Mythologies of Ancient Mexico and Peru* (1s. net).

Dr. Frank Ballard has now been set apart by his Church for the office of Lecturer in Apologetic. And no sooner is he set apart than he publishes an excellent popular summary of the things which are most surely believed among us. Its title is *Christian Essentials, a Restatement for the People of To-day* (Culley; 5s. net). Much of the book has the New Theology directly before it, for Dr. Ballard is not the man to answer the unbelief that is past. But he does not stay over the New Theology. He knows that all these little systems have their day and cease to be. He reckons it his business, therefore, to prepare the people of to-day for the arguments that are to be used against Christianity to-morrow. Thus the book is occupied mainly with a constructive statement of what Christianity is. At another time, and perhaps from another man, it would have taken the form of a treatise on systematic theology.

The theology is systematic enough, but 'the time is short,' and Dr. Ballard is not concerned about his system if he can get men to receive the truth as it is in Jesus.

Professor Henry C. Sheldon's *History of Unbelief in the Nineteenth Century* (Culley; 5s. net) may not take its place among the immortals beside Cairns's *Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century*, but it is a book that had to be written by someone, and Professor Sheldon has written it well. He divides the theories of unbelief into three parts—(1) Philosophical Theories; (2) Quasi-Scientific, Theological, and Ethical Theories; (3) Critical Theories. And within one or other of those divisions he is able to gather every high thing in the nineteenth century that exalted itself against the knowledge of God. His reading has not only been in many different departments, but it has been reading which gave him an understanding in each department. One feels, after going through his book, that at the beginning of the twentieth century the foundation of God stands more sure than ever it did. Dr. Sheldon is no bigot. However antagonistic to Christianity, there is not one of all the writers of the nineteenth century of whom he says that his writing was altogether in vain. Even Huxley, 'in so far as he battled to secure a fair hearing for science, is deserving of respect and praise.' If he had been a bigot his book might still have been worth reading, but in this tolerant time it would not have been read. Not only will it be read, but it will be read with pleasure. And of the books which have been deliberately written for Christ's sake and the gospel's, there are very few of recent issue that are likely to do more good.

Dr. J. W. Thirtle wrote a book on the Titles of the Psalms for scholars. Dr. E. W. Bullinger has rewritten the substance of it for the people. But he has waited for the publication of Dr. Thirtle's second book, on the Songs of Degrees, and has given a popular account of it also. These make up the volume entitled *The Chief Musician* (Eyre and Spottiswoode; 6s.). The book is attractively written, and the publishers also have done their part well.

The year after the death of John Hamilton Thom there was published a volume of his sermons

entitled *A Spiritual Faith*, with a preface by Dr. Martineau. Neither it nor the earlier volume, *Christ the Revealer*, has been so popular, we think, as *Laws of Life after the Mind of Christ*. However, the new abridged edition (Philip Green; 2s. net) will do something for the book. It is thoroughly characteristic.

Mr. Claude Montefiore has been reminding us of 'the appalling difficulty' of writing about any religion. 'If you write about your own religion,' he says, 'you cannot be properly impartial; if you write about another religion, you cannot know it from within.' If we cannot wait until this appalling difficulty is removed, let us in the meantime read those who write from within. The Hon. and Rev. James Adderley writes from within on *The Catholicism of the Church of England* (Griffiths; 2s. 6d. net).

In Mr. Griffiths' 'English Preachers' Series there has appeared a volume by the Rev. W. Manning, M.A., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Leytonstone. Its title is *Some Elements of Religion* (3s. net). We are sure the title is not *intended* to challenge comparison with Liddon.

*The Story of the Other Wise Man*, by Henry van Dyke (Harper; 2s.). Tradition says that the wise men were three—Caspar, Melchior, and Balthazar. Dr. van Dyke dreamed one night that a fourth wise man set out from Ecbatana whose name was Artaban. He carried three jewels, a sapphire, a ruby, and a pearl, as tribute to the King. But when he reached Babylon, where he was to join the three, he stumbled upon an exiled Jew who seemed to be dying of neglect. He stayed to restore him to life and hope. The three wise men meantime had departed, and he never came up with them. When he reached Bethlehem the Holy Family had gone down into Egypt. He shielded an infant of Bethlehem from Herod's murdering soldiery. Then he wandered three-and-thirty years seeking the promised King, and returned to Jerusalem just as they led Jesus to Calvary. He had spent one of his jewels in Babylon succouring the exiled Hebrew. With another he had bribed the captain of Herod's soldiers. He had still the third to present to the King, but as he hurried to Calvary a female slave of his own nation pleaded for redemption, and his last jewel went as ransom. He



never saw the King on earth, but as his soul passed he heard 'Inasmuch as ye did it.'

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published the fourth volume of the seventh series of the *Expositor* (7s. 6d. net). Its most noticeable feature is the number of separate articles it contains. There is no subject that is continued over three numbers, and very few subjects are continued over one. The topics of keenest present-day interest discussed in it are the New Theology towards the beginning of the volume, and the Elephantinê discoveries at the end. The core of misapprehension in the New Theology, God's Immanence, is expressed in intelligible language by Principal Iverach.

None of the Prophets is so misunderstood by the careless Bible reader as Jeremiah; none of them exercises such a fascination over the student of the Bible. The latest loving monograph is *Jeremiah, the Man and His Message*, by J. R. Gillies (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). Mr. Gillies's book will come to some as a revelation—a revelation of Mr. Gillies as well as of the Prophet Jeremiah. It is at once scholarship and literature. Every chapter is a work of patient art, but it is over the last chapters that the reader will linger longest. For in them many things combine to heighten the interest—the recent discoveries at Elephantinê, the mystery of God's ways with His servants, the majesty of a prophet.

The new volumes of Dr. Maclaren's *Expositions of Holy Scripture* cover much ground. One of them runs from the 8th chapter of 2 Kings to the end of Nehemiah; the other deals with the Books of Esther, Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes. And so it comes to pass that those books which were most edifying to the Jews are least edifying to us. If Dr. Maclaren has little to say about them, it means that modern preaching has little to say about them. For Dr. Maclaren is a typical modern preacher, and has no peculiar partiality for one book or one particular kind of literature over another. The surprise is the Book of Proverbs. Dr. Maclaren spends 226 pages upon it; and that is more than most preachers would spend. Why is the Book of Proverbs not in greater favour in our day? Is it not evangelical enough? If it were not evangelical, Dr. Maclaren would have nothing to do with it.

Let us just mention the issue by Messrs. Luzac of two Oriental books. The one is a translation from the Turkish of Hassan Chevky Hassib's *Waridat-ul-Habib Li Tanwir-il-Labib*, that is, the Revelations of Habib for the Enlightenment of the Wise (5s.). The other is an essay on *The Future of Turkey*, translated from the German of Dr. Mehemed Emin Efendi (1s. 6d.).

What is a devotional commentary? Sometimes it seems to be a commentary written to attack criticism, and sometimes one written in entire ignorance of the existence of criticism. Dr. Horton understands that it is a commentary which is thoroughly conversant with the results of criticism, and builds upon them.

Dr. Horton has written *A Devotional Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew* (Thomas Law; 3s. 6d. net). Its actual contents are everything which the ordinary commentary contains, except the critical processes—geography and botany, symbolism and homiletic. But there is one respect in which it leaves all existing commentaries behind, it possesses unfailing human interest. Was there ever a commentary published before of which one could read the notes right on, note after note, without a hint of weariness? So welcome is this characteristic, and so surpassing, that it seems as if Dr. Horton had just discovered his best gift. If we are not mistaken he will be encouraged to write more devotional commentaries.

A volume of *Tennyson* in the Eversley Series will be one of the books to look forward to every month for a good many months to come. Go in for this edition at once. It began last month (Macmillan; 4s. net).

Messrs. Macmillan are now able to offer us a complete History of the Church in four volumes at 10s. 6d. each. The history of the first six centuries has been written by Archdeacon Cheetham; the Middle Ages and the Reformation each by Archdeacon Hardwick; and the modern period by Archdeacon Cheetham. It should be noted that there are new editions of Hardwick's volumes edited by Bishop Stubbs. Dr. Cheetham's volume on the modern period has just been published. Its proper title is *A History of the Christian Church since the Reformation*.

The outward appearance of the volume is quite

familiar—its purple binding, its solid page, its marginal synopsis, its footnotes in double column. How should we describe it? As a student's history? But we are all students now. Is it for schools or colleges? Or is it for the student who has passed all these and is hoping to become a scholar yet? The arrangement of this volume is so evidently made for study that the arm-chair reader may revolt from it. Nevertheless it may be read with the most ordinary expenditure of mental energy; and the things it treats of are so familiar to every grown man that the most careless reader will be easily captivated.

One might criticize the volume and say that it is superficial. It is not really superficial, however; it is only summary. There is a strong enough grasp of the issues. But within the space how could a whole history of the Church since the Reformation be treated otherwise than summarily? We can easily prophesy for it the largest circulation of any volume of the series. For it contains a reliable account, with well-marked dates, of the most interesting period in the history of the Church, and it has few competitors.

Messrs. Marshall Brothers have this month published several valuable books in experimental religion. Among them there is a volume on *Christian Sanity* (2s. 6d.), by Dr. A. T. Schofield. The title is attractive and timely, and Dr. Schofield works the subject out in a thoroughly practical and satisfying way. One chapter is entitled 'The Bible on Christian Sanity.' It deals with 'Paul, thou art mad,' and with the graver charge addressed to our Lord, 'He hath a devil, and is mad,' and many passages besides. Another chapter is called 'Sanity in Revivals,' another 'Sanity in the Higher Life,' and another 'The Wiles of the Devil.' We congratulate Dr. Schofield on the sanity he has shown in the treatment of so very sensational a subject.

The next is a volume by Mr. George Clarke on *True Manhood, Womanhood* (2s. 6d.). Mr. Clarke means true manhood and true womanhood in Christ. So it is an answer to the question, What must I do that I may obtain eternal life?

Mrs. Kilvington has sent *A Message to the Kingdom of Priests* (1s. net).

Dr. A. T. Pierson has gathered into a little book four Bible readings given at Keswick in 1907, and has called the book by the extraordinary title of

*A Spiritual Clinique*. The four readings are on Unsubdued Sin, Unanswered Prayer, Persistent Darkness, and Habitual Unbelief. When he comes to Habitual Unbelief, Dr. Pierson has to consider the matter of election, of which he offers the definition of a coloured preacher: 'Breddren, de Lord, He vote fur. ye, and de Debbil, he vote agin ye, and when you vote wid de Lord, dat's election.'

We must mention also *The Coming of the Lord*, by Captain W. H. Dawson (1s.); *After this I will Return*, by Dr. J. H. Townsend (1s. net); and *I am a Prayer*, and other Poems, by Ada R. Habershon (1s. net).

Principal Garvie has undertaken the editorship of a new series of Commentaries on the New Testament. It is to be called 'The Westminster New Testament.' The publisher is Mr. Andrew Melrose. The first volume to appear is St. John, of which the author is the Rev. Henry W. Clarke. From this volume it is plain to see that the Westminster Commentary is to be put into the hands of those who are just beginning the study of the Bible. It may take a little Christian experience for granted, but very little scientific Bible knowledge. Well, there is a vast assembly waiting for it. Barnes' New Testament sold by thousands amongst Sunday School teachers and the like. This is as simple as Barnes and more scientific. The outward appearance is not quite so attractive as we should have expected, but the price is very low (2s. net).

Mr. R. A. Torrey the evangelist addresses himself deliberately to the most orthodox in our midst. Is he wise, then, to write a book about *The Difficulties in the Bible* (Nisbet; 1s. 6d.)? He has no difficulty in clearing every one of the difficulties out of the way. But what if his readers remember the difficulty, and forget the way in which he gets rid of it?

Messrs. Nisbet have also published the thirteenth edition revised of *The Gospel and its Ministry*, by Sir Robert Anderson, K.C.B., LL.D. (2s. 6d. net).

There is no department of literary work which offers a better opportunity to the inventor than the art of making a Bibliography. It includes, as a subordinate branch, the art of Indexing. Some



books are published without an index of any kind. We know one theological publishing house which seems to prefer the indexless book, as certain dog fanciers are said to prefer the tailless dog.

The best bibliographer we know is Mr. Northcote W. Thomas, M.A., F.R.A.I. His new *Bibliography of Anthropology and Folklore for 1906* (Nutt; 2s. net) is a masterpiece and a model. The whole subject is first of all divided into groups geographically, and then the books and periodicals are arranged alphabetically in each group under the author's name. Last of all come two indexes, the one of periodicals, the other of subjects. And the subject index is made more useful by a preliminary grouping, not geographically this time, but topically. It is as great a joy to the student to use a good index as to the woodman to handle a good axe.

Messrs. Rivingtons have begun a series of 'Scripture Text-Books for Children to read Themselves.' The first issue is a *Life of our Lord*; the second is *The Beginnings of the Church of Christ*. We have not seen the first, the second fulfils its mission. It is written by G. P. Trevelyan, M.A., and E. A. Edghill, B.A. (8d. net).

When Professor James delighted the religious world with his book on *The Will to Believe*, he left it open for somebody to write a book on *The Will to Doubt*. The book has been written by Professor Alfred H. Lloyd, of the University of Michigan (Sonnenschein; 4s. 6d.). Whether the religious world did well to be delighted with Professor James's book, we need not consider now. It has only to be said that they need not be alarmed at Professor Lloyd's. For Professor Lloyd is as good a friend to religion as Professor James, and his book is as near to the mind of Christ. All he works for is to make us think, and there was nothing for which our Lord Himself worked harder than to make us think, unless it was to save us.

Still, Mr. Lloyd seems to think that he must begin with an apology, which he divides into five sentences. Firstly, we are all universal doubters. Secondly, doubt is a phase, nay, a vital condition of all consciousness. Thirdly, doubt is inseparable from habit. Fourthly, doubt is necessary to life, to real life, to deep experience. And fifthly, man's widespread, or rather his universal, sense of dependence begets doubt.

The book belongs to the Ethical Library. If there were a Religious Library it might find a place there. It is a modern constructive sermon on the text, 'Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.'

It is a long, long time since men began to occupy themselves with the mystery and the manipulation of numbers. Numbers still possess their fascination. Mr. Elliot Stock has published *The Mystery of Three* (3s. 6d.), a book in which the author, E. M. Smith, after gathering out of the Bible all the occurrences of the number three, has set forth their value for present-day homiletics.

The Oriental Society of the Western Theological Seminary has undertaken the issue of a series of volumes under the title of 'Researches in Biblical Archæology.' The first volume has been written by Dr. Olaf A. Toffteen, Professor of Semitic Languages in the Seminary. Its subject is *Ancient Chronology* (University of Chicago Press; \$2.50 net).

The volume covers the ancient chronology of Palestine, Assyria, Babylonia, and Egypt, down to 1050 B.C. The period from this date to the Christian era will be dealt with in a subsequent volume.

The Biblical Chronology occupies the first short chapter. It is an outline only. The problems raised by it are to be examined in a separate volume, to be called *Side-Lights on Biblical Chronology*. Until that volume appears it is impossible to discuss Dr. Toffteen's rather precarious theory of the chronology of the Judges, that most difficult period in all the history of Israel. This volume, therefore, appeals to the archæologist rather than to the student of the Bible in the narrow sense. It contains all the materials for determining the chronology of the Empires of Babylonia, Assyria, and Egypt; and the more important documents or inscriptions are presented in facsimile or photograph.

If you would see Professor Pfeiderer at his most characteristic, and at his best, read *Religion and Historic Faiths* (Fisher Unwin; 5s. net). It is a volume of lectures, and Pfeiderer loves the lecture form. It gives him room for the large generalizations he delights in, and for the freedom of his flowing style. In this volume he describes every one of the great religions of the earth, hitting off each of them in a short chapter, without a

moment's hesitation. And more than that, he describes religion itself. How sure he is of the way in which religion first came into existence amongst men. Was not the very beginning of it a dream—a dream that some dead friend had come to life again? How natural it has all been. How absolutely non-supernatural. How careful God has been to leave man to find Him out for himself. The Christian Fathers may not have believed this, but Pfeiderer has no resentment against the Christian Fathers for not agreeing with him. It is to one of them he goes for his definition of religion. It is to Lactantius. And a beautiful definition it is. Pfeiderer prints it in italics as we do: *Religion is the attachment to God by the bond of piety.* \_\_\_\_\_

An anthology of poems in praise of the Virgin has been made by the Hon. Alison Stourton, and has been published in a very attractive volume by Messrs. Washbourne. The title is *Regina Poetarum*. There are ancient poems and modern. This is one of the modern:

The Christ-child lay on Mary's lap,  
His hair was like a light.  
(O weary, weary were the world,  
But here is all aright).

The Christ-child lay on Mary's breast,  
His hair was like a star.  
(O stern and cunning are the kings,  
But here the true hearts are).

The Christ-child lay on Mary's heart,  
His hair was like a fire.  
(O weary, weary is the world,  
But here the world's desire).

The Christ-child stood at Mary's knee,  
His hair was like a crown,  
And all the flowers looked up at Him,  
And all the stars looked down.

Messrs. Washbourne have also published *A Key to Meditation*, or Simple Methods of Mental Prayer, etc. Based on the spiritual exercises of Saint Ignatius. Translated from the French of Père Crasset, S.J. (3s. 6d. net); and a sketch of the life of St. Francis under the title of *In the School of St. Francis* (1s.). \_\_\_\_\_

If any one denies that the study of Church history has entered upon a new chapter, he will deny it no longer, when he discovers Dr. Scullard's new book. It is a study of *Early Christian Ethics in the West* (Williams and Norgate; 6s.). We dare not say there is no religion in it. For Dr. Scullard is not one to think that ethics and religion can be separated. But we dare say there is no ecclesiasticism in it. And is that not a revolution in the study of Church history?

The way in which Dr. Scullard builds his book is a revolution. He lays down the ethical ideas, and then he turns to the Christian writers to see how they conform to them. He does not take his ethical ideas from Irenæus or Ambrose. He takes them from Christ. He even goes back beyond the beginning of Christianity for them. And then when he has got them he has no consideration for the ecclesiastical eminence of Irenæus or Ambrose or any other. He asks them how they meet the demands of an ethical Christianity.

## The Pilgrim's Progress.

BY THE REV. JOHN KELMAN, M.A., D.D., EDINBURGH.

### The River Side.

THE opening words of this passage at once take us back to the thought and life of ancient Palestine. This river was familiar both to David and to John. The thought and metaphor of the river was a favourite one with Israel, both in Old and New Testament times. The Jews always planted their synagogues beside a river (cf. the story of Lydia at

Philippi). The Jordan was, of course, their great national river; yet it was the Euphrates which, in the times of the Exile, had set the type of their thought in this, and given to them some of their finest religious poetry. That great river of Babylon was, indeed, associated with thoughts of woe and misery; yet they had felt its greatness and the quiet of its broad surface, and it was not without a pang of bitter longing that they had heard the



great words of Isaiah, 'Thus had thy peace been like the river, and thy righteousness like the waves of the sea.'

The haunting consciousness of such full streams, in striking contrast to the intermittent rush and barrenness of the torrent-beds of their native land found its fullest expression in the conception of a 'river of God' that was full of water. And Bunyan was entirely justified in identifying that Old Testament figure with the River of the Water of Life, which flows through the Book of the Revelation of St. John the Divine. It is difficult to define and sharply to identify this stream. It is, indeed, certainly the river of divine grace, but what precisely that will mean to the individual will be determined by the circumstances and needs of each. Like all symbolic poetry, this will find a separate meaning for each reader. Of it, the story which is told of Robert Browning's 'Childe Roland' will be equally true. It is said that, on being asked what that great symbolic poem meant, he replied that it meant for each reader what each reader found it to mean.

The idyllic character of the allegory in this part leads to a poem of distinctly better quality than those which Bunyan usually writes. At least, the first two lines have a certain lingering and haunting beauty about them, which connects them in the memory with Milton's translation of Psalm 84th :

They pass through Baca's thirsty vale,  
That dry and barren ground,  
As through a fruitful watery dale  
Where springs and showers abound.

Or George Herbert's well-known lines :

I blesse thee, Lord, because I grow  
Among thy trees, which in a row  
To thee both fruit and order ow.

The meadow of ease, too, beside the stream, is an idyllic figure, conceived and treated with great beauty. 'Curiously beautified with lilies' is a touch of pre-Raphaelite artistry which it would tax the genius of Rossetti to surpass. It reminds us of Longfellow's *Dante* ('Purgatorio,' vii. 70) :

'Twixt hill and plain there was a winding path  
Which led us to the margin of that dell,  
Where dies the border more than half away.  
Gold and fine silver, and scarlet and pearl-white,  
The Indian wood resplendent and serene,  
Fresh emerald the moment it is broken,  
By herbage and by flowers within that hollow  
Planted, each one in colour would be vanquished  
As by its greater vanquished is the less.

(compare also Longfellow's *Dante*, 'Purgatorio,' xxviii. 1, and see his notes on both passages).

The ethical and spiritual significance of the whole scene is plain enough. It stands for a time of pathless religious luxury, in which there are no fences at the wayside, and no sense of restraint in the conscience. Such an experience may come after a revival of religion in the soul, or in the peace that follows successful conflict, or (as in this case) in the sweetness of solitude or Christian fellowship that follows a time of uncongenial society among worldly, and worse than worldly, men. It may appear, and it may really be the case, that the pleasantness of the hour is caused by 'a clear and comfortable sense of divine love'; but yet, nevertheless, the man may find that his severe conscience of fidelity has become relaxed, and luxurious softness taken the place of self-denial, with its bracing and healthful endurance of hardness.

Bunyan feared such times. Even in his description of the trees he mentions the possibility of surfeits and too great fulness of blood. Certainly, as one writer has pointed out, it is a striking fact that more misfortunes of one kind or another befell the pilgrims during this later period than during either of the former ones, and that that part of Christian's journey spent in the austere companionship of Faithful was entirely free from misadventures of the kind we are to hear of immediately. Mr. Froude has well caught the spirit of Bunyan in his words : 'Man's spiritual existence is like the flight of a bird in the air ; he is sustained only by effort, and when he ceases to exert himself he falls.' 'Oh, thought I, that I were fourscore years old, that I might die quickly, and my soul be at rest.' The whole situation is finely expressed in a sentence of Mrs. Josephine Butler's : 'I have learned in a long lifetime, now drawing to a close, to beware of *halcyon* days.'

### The Stile and Meadow.

One of the greatest of John Bunyan's plagues and sorrows was that of shortlived religious impressions : 'Surely I will not forget this forty years hence.' 'But, alas ! within less than forty days I began to question all again,' etc. That is but one of many such complaints with which every reader of *Grace Abounding* is familiar. The impressions are the work of a time of strain and tension ; the passing of them comes generally with the renewal

of ease. So these men thought that all danger was over and behind them, 'but they were not yet at their journey's end.' Robert Browning, who knows well the perplexing and surprising character of the way of life's pilgrimage, has expressed this in rough lines, which yet fasten upon the memory :

And where we looked for crowns to fall,  
We find the tug's to come,—that's all.

The times of victory, the apparently uneventful dull hour just after temptation, are the times in which, above all, we need to be watchful. The monks of Melrose were threatened by an English invading force on one historic occasion. They waited in silence and in fear till the Southern army, not having observed their low-lying abbey, had gone past them. Then they rang their bells in a merry peal of jubilation. But they rang too soon, for the invaders heard the bells, returned, and pulled the religious house about the ears of its inhabitants.

The lesson of this passage can hardly be, however, that ease is in itself an evil thing. 'Avoid,' says Newman, 'the great evils of leisure, avoid the snare of having time on your hands.' Yet this riverside lay direct on the path, and, for a time, to avoid it would have been to forsake the right way of pilgrimage. The sin lay not in leisure and pleasantness, but in the mood which refused to follow the way when it led away from those green pastures and gentle waters, and became again the mere dull, hard, straight path of righteousness. R. L. Stevenson, in his *Travels with a Donkey*, quotes another passage from Bunyan: 'The way also here was very wearisome, through dirt and slabbiness: nor was there on all this ground so much as one inn or victualling-house wherein to refresh the feebler sort.' At another time he notes the length of the way—'Two miles yet'—as portrayed in the inimitable little woodcut of Miss Ennice Bagster. In this case it is neither the slabbiness nor the length of the road that tires the pilgrims, but its roughness to their feet, softened with walking on riverside grass. Whatever be the peculiarity which renders the way trying at any given point, it is a folly and the beginning of sin to quarrel with it. The only thing that really matters is the fact that it is the way. With its surface or direction or length we have nothing to do. Safety lies in 'setting our hearts to the highway,' consoling ourselves with the great assurance that it is indeed the way, and that our feet are on it. He who does this has (to quote Stevenson once

again) the road itself for company. His interest, his longing, and his enthusiasm are all concentrated, not on his own feelings, but on the road itself. He will yet find out the glory of going on through pleasant and unpleasant parts of the pathway, when he has at last discovered the love and wisdom of God who has made that various pilgrimage now smooth and then rough, that he may welcome at the last pilgrims disciplined and strong and worthy to arrive.

But these men are discouraged, and their feet are tender. They are quarrelling with the way, and pitying their own weak flesh. Just beside them lies Bypath Meadow, a place, indeed, of bad company, but of bodily luxuriousness very tempting to their present mood. It is so little off the way that the fact seems hardly worth speaking about. So they trudge on, grudgingly and discontented.

Just at this point comes the opportunity for escape to the softer going. The stile on the left hand comes like a set temptation, so opportune is it in its answer to their desire. Yet it was not quite an open gap. It was easy to cross the stile, and yet there was the stile to cross—some conscientious scruples to be overcome, some need for effort to persuade oneself to the defiance or the ignoring of the plain sense of duty. This, however, is beside the point. The interesting fact is the circumstance of the stile and the mood, of temptation within and opportunity without. There is little need for explaining this by the malice of the powers of darkness. The fact is that the whole length of the road is furnished with opportunities of escape from it, but we become aware of these, find them to be temptations, only when desire for escape is already at work within our hearts. No man who is quarrelling with the road will be long before he finds himself at a stile of this sort. This is well worth remembering. Temptations often assume the guise of special providences, which make the step aside appear almost a predestined arrangement. And the soul is peculiarly ready to deceive itself by taking such psychological moments as inevitable, and justifying its errant course by a daring attempt so to read the signs as to force God on to the side of temptation.

In such temptation, half-consciously self-sought and self-created, there is little chance of victory and no joy of combat. Temptation need not be a joyless and predetermined thing. It is so only in cases where the tempted man is quarrelling with the way. But where there is no such complication



of a treachery within the soul, temptation is among the most exhilarating of life's experiences. When the heart is pure from all desire of falling, and where the faith in God's character and purpose is firm, the tempted may 'count it all joy when they fall into divers temptations.' Theirs is that 'stern joy which warriors feel' upon the eve of battle. Even for them this will not warrant rashness, and to the end the wise will repeat the prayer, 'Lead us not into temptation.' Yet when temptation comes they will remember that God, who has permitted it to come, is not a general who ever sends troops of His into battle that they may be cut down for strategic purposes in other parts of the field. If the humble petition of the Lord's Prayer is unanswered, and temptation has to be faced, they may take it as a distinguished honour and a mark of special trust.

Was the trial sore?

Temptation sharp? Thank God a second time!  
Why comes temptation but for man to meet  
And fight with and make crouch beneath his foot,  
And so be pedestalled in triumph? Pray  
'Lead us into no such temptations, Lord!'  
Yea, but, Oh Thou whose servants are the bold,  
Lead such temptations by the head and hair,  
Reluctant dragons, up to who dares fight,  
That so he may do battle and have praise.

### Vain-Confidence.

This temptation, however, was of the different sort that has its ally within the soul, and the hardihood and unhesitating promptness of action which are seen in Christian are a poor travesty of a Christian man's assurance. Indeed, he is in every way unlike himself in this scene; and, among other things, we note his eagerness to have that inward treachery justified by external reinforcement. They see a man walking before them in the growing twilight, and after night has fallen still they follow the sound of his footsteps in the dark. Then the footsteps ceased to sound, and their hearts stood still as they heard the dull thud from that pit to whose brink he had almost led them. No words came from the mangled body, 'only they heard a groaning.' That is all the incident, and its dramatic power is heightened by its reticence. To the already troubled conscience of Christian that tragedy is his own. Vain-Confidence is just Christian in his recent mood, written large. That man, needing no company, asking for no advice, mistaking his own will for wisdom, and making it his law. He has no need of

them or any others to confirm him in his opinion. He flings over his shoulder his answer to Christian's question, shouted forward to him with already a quaver of anxiety in it. There is no such quaver in the reply. He knows all about his destination; it is the Celestial Gate. The words were still ringing in the pilgrim's ears when this unhappy victim of the easy pathway in fact reached his destination, but not the one he had made so sure of. Such ruffling spirits as this should never meet with an accident. The contrast is too cruelly foolish between the swaggering of afternoon and the groaning in the dark of evening.

### The Men in the Dark.

The part of the story which follows is one of utter discouragement, danger, and misery. The two strong men are like a pair of little lost children. Each feels himself alone, and Hopeful's groaning utterance is of peculiar pathos, with its pronoun not in the plural, but the singular, 'Oh, that I had kept on my way!' That deadly dark, the dull aftertime of temptation, when the desire and the glamour alike are gone, and the spent fires of its allurements no longer keep back the growing cold that gathers round the heart! How cruelly all the aspect of life changes in such an hour, and, instead of all the fascinating casuistry which at the crossing of the stile made the whole play of good and evil about the soul so charmingly poignant an experience, there is only the one dull but insistent conviction 'that it is easier going out of the way when we are in than going in when we are out.' The *diablerie* of the casuist makes the man feel so superior; the plain obviousness of the truism announces him so poor and lost a fool. Which things are happening every day, and it is well for every man to cultivate the habit of looking across from mood to mood, and to train his imagination so that it may be able before temptation to picture to him the aspect that life will assume after temptation.

In Dr. Newman's *Plain and Parochial Sermons* (v.) there is a passage so appropriate and illuminative for this scene, that it may be quoted here at length: 'And we thus intrude into things forbidden, in various ways: in reading what we should not read, in hearing what we should not hear, in seeing what we should not see, in going into company whither we should not go, in presumptuous reasonings and arguings when we should have faith, in acting as if we were our own

masters where we should obey. We indulge our reason, we indulge our passions, we indulge our ambition, our vanity, our love of power ; we throw ourselves into the society of bad, worldly, or careless men ; and all the while we think that, after having acquired this miserable knowledge of good and evil, we can return to our duty, and continue where we left off ; merely going aside a moment to shake ourselves, as Samson did, and with an ignorance like his, that our true heavenly strength is departed from us.' . . . 'The two paths of right and wrong start from the same point, and at first are separated by a very small difference . . . but wait a while, and pursue the road leading to destruction, and you will find the distance between the two has widened beyond measurement, and that between them a great gulf has been sunk, so that you cannot pass from the one to the other, though you desire it ever so earnestly.'

They had forgotten all about the stile when it could easily have been found, and now they cannot get back to it. Mind and conscience both have been deranged by disobedience, and neither of them can get into the position where they will feel the old conscience scruples that were so lightly overcome. Their one thought is of danger, and after a few blind and futile plunges for the road, they settle down, sick with reaction and disgust, wearied out with transgression and peril, and fall asleep. One cannot but feel that strenuousness would even yet have brought deliverance. Stile or no stile, floods or no floods, why did they not force their way back to the road ? Easy words to say, but the soul that has wandered knows but too well how that wandering has impaired the very power of returning to duty, and that is the last farthing of the full payment that an exacting nemesis wrings out from the sinner.

### Christian in this Incident.

Christian is here unrecognizable. He never did well with ease, but here he is so completely and radically demoralized that we shudder at the change, which reveals the Protean character of even so good a man. There is always a pitiful crowd, as someone has expressed it, waiting at the cross-roads of life to take their direction from any chance circumstance. But it makes the heart sick to find Christian among that number. He who questioned Demas so shrewdly now takes one for a guide whose face he has never looked upon, who,

so far as Christian's experience of him goes, is a *vox et præterea nihil*. In an unknown region of life precedent is a first necessity if it can be had, and the initial question of the wise adventurer is, 'Who goes before me?' But this Christian, at other times so sagacious, is now content that he is not the first. So long as *somebody* is on ahead, he has nothing more to ask, and at once follows the lead, without a hint of evidence as to its trustworthiness. The world would need to be by very many thousand times a safer place than it is before the mere fact that someone else had gone in any given path before would afford even the shadow of justification for such an adventure. Yet that is all that multitudes of men ask for guidance. A newspaper article, the example of an acquaintance, the mere fact that the thing has once been done, are sufficient for such easy followers of chance guidance in an age of many incompetent but unhesitating guides.

### Hopeful in this Incident.

Hopeful and Vain-Confidence may stand for symbols of two different kinds of optimism. Hopeful has his scruples, and remains humble while he believes in God and in life. Vain-Confidence believes unscrupulously and only in himself. Yet hopeful is weak as yet, and all too easily led. He has not learned to say *No*, nor to think for himself upon the spur of the moment. But life is teaching him, and this very incident is manifestly doing something towards correcting his weakness. He takes the initiative, and offers to go first as leader on the way back. And meanwhile, except for a momentary suggestion of blame, his old tenderness and sweetness are only heightened by the manifestly growing manliness of his spirit. The gentle tenderness of his attitude to Christian is a notable piece of work, even for John Bunyan's pen. No wonder that it called forth the comment from the editor of one edition of the allegory : 'Dear Shepherd of Israel, thou knowest that to err is human. Keep us from erring ; guide us continually ; and wherever we stray, O Lord, reclaim us.' Along with which prayer, however, may well be joined George Herbert's lines :

Who goeth in the way which Christ hath gone,  
Is much more sure to meet with him, than one  
That travelleth byways :  
Perhaps my God, though he be farre before,  
May turn, and take me by the hand, and more,  
May strengthen my decays.



## Social Theories and the Teaching of Jesus.

BY THE REV. D. A. MACFADYEN, M.A., HIGHGATE.

### IV.

#### The Theology of the Movement.

A BRIEF summary of the New Testament basis of Christian Socialism has brought us to this point. We have found that there is a conception of a Christian society which is suggested by the teaching of Christ. That is enough for most Christian Socialists. They are content to rest for their criticism of society as it is, and their hope of society as it should be, on the bedrock of the word of Christ, and to leave theological questions alone. But no Christian movement is without theological bearings of some kind, and this is no exception to the rule.

If one has been accustomed to view a landscape from the east, and is suddenly transported to the west, the old landscape presents new features. The lights bring into prominence different aspects of field and valley and copse. There is a like gain in changing our theological point of view, even though we keep in sight the familiar doctrines. We may look for some interesting suggestions from the change of view which makes the society central rather than the individual.

For instance, the thought which makes social relations primary for man finds a warrant and justification in the Christian idea of God. The peculiarity of the Christian belief in God is just this, that it regards the Divine Life as a perfected society. The highest conception of life is not individual but social. The belief in the Trinity—the Father, Son, and Spirit abiding in a complex unity in all eternity—found a place first in the teaching of Jesus and His apostles, not at all as a metaphysical but as an ethical relation. The relations of Father, Son, and Spirit were revealed as a type of life. It was a type of life deliberately suggested by Jesus as something to which His disciples were to approximate. ‘That they may all be one: even as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be in us.’

Looked at in this way, a doctrine which is put aside by many as a hopeless metaphysical subtlety, becomes full of value. The vital social relations are there, each in its perfect form. Authority is

there in its highest expression. Justice and mercy, righteousness and love, are all revealed in the relation of the Father and Son. Obedience is there in its ideal form of submission of will, resting on perfect mutual understanding and confidence (cf. Jn 5<sup>19-47</sup> 8<sup>28</sup> 6<sup>38</sup>). Service is perfected in the perfect servant (Jn 13<sup>1-20</sup>). Care and insight are absolute. Dependence is there (Jn 8<sup>88</sup> 11<sup>42</sup>); generosity (Mt 7<sup>11</sup>); fidelity (Jn 11<sup>42</sup>); truth (Jn 1<sup>14</sup>). Mutual sympathy is absolute because the Spirit is the perfect interpreter, the Divine exegete of every purpose and the channel of every expression of will. In this perfect society familiar relations are seen in an aspect which suggests that this is what they were meant to be. We find the Trinity—the Divine society—presenting to us the image in which human society was created.

As soon as the Christian has interpreted his creed for himself in this way, he finds that it has become a criticism of the social relations he knows. If human society is created in the likeness of the Divine, it cannot be according to the purpose of God that authority should be in the hands of a metallic god which has neither heart to feel nor head to think, but only power to crush these out of others. It cannot be according to His purpose that to be a servant should ever mean to be crushed between the upper millstone of avarice and the nether millstone of starvation. It cannot be in His purpose that fatherhood should be reduced to a mere physiological relation by hours of labour, and motherhood sacrificed to the exigencies of an industrial system. It is a flat rejection of the Divine ideal of fatherhood and sonship that a son may be driven to compete against his father in the labour market and drive him out of work.

The belief that humanity is made in the likeness of the Divine social life is a substantial reason for attaching supreme importance to perfecting social relations. Only in a perfected society can even the individual fulfil his destiny. Completeness is not solitary but social. Authority is to conform to

the type of the father, obedience to the type of the son. Dependence is not to be severed from sympathy. Insight and patience meet alike in the relations of man and servant. The whole

society is to be bound by mutual understanding created by unity of spirit. A history which begins with 'in the beginning God ——' does not reach its natural end until we 'see the holy city.'

## Contributions and Comments.

### Was Tidal, King of Nations, a Hittite?

THE cuneiform records of the Hittite empire, discovered by Professor Winckler at Boghaz Keui, have informed us that the successor of Khattusib II., with whom Ramses II. made the well-known treaty, was his son Dud-Khaliya. In the Egyptian inscriptions this name is written Tidal, Todal, the Hittite guttural aspirate being as little regarded as it is in the Greek Athar-ata by the side of Atargatis. Dud-Khaliya, however, bears so close a resemblance to Tud-ghula, the cuneiform equivalent of the Biblical Tid'al in the Chedor-laomer texts, that it raises the question whether the names are not one and the same. Tid'al, according to Gn 14<sup>1</sup>, was 'king of Nations,' that is to say, the Babylonian Umman Manda, with whose help, as we learn from the Chedor-laomer texts, the king of Elam was enabled to conquer Babylonia. The Umman Manda, it is true, generally denoted the 'Nations' of Kurdistan, but the name was also applied to any horde of northern invaders, and Esar-haddon, accordingly, uses it of Teispes, the Cimmerian.

A recent discovery of Mr. King has shown that the fall of the Amorite dynasty to which Khammu-rabi or Amraphel belonged was brought about by an invasion of Babylonia by the Hittites. There is therefore no longer any reason for doubting that the references to 'the king of the Hittites' in the great Babylonian work on astronomy go back to the Khammu-rabi age when it was compiled. Here we are told how, after the murder of the (Babylonian) king, the king of the Hittites 'comes and seizes on the throne.' The fall of the Khammu-rabi dynasty was followed at no long interval of time by the establishment of the Kassite rule at Babylon, and the Kassites were an Elamite tribe. Hence it would not be surprising if at a somewhat earlier date Chedor-laomer had been

assisted by Hittites in his conquest of Babylonia. At all events, the possibility is worth consideration.

A. H. SAYCE.

Assuan.

### Job ii. 9.

A FURTHER note on this passage may perhaps be acceptable to Mr. Potten. The rendering of the A.V. is certainly ancient. The Syriac Peshitta reads, 'Even until now dost thou persist in thine integrity [or, simplicity]? curse thy God, and die.' The reading of the LXX is remarkable. Job's wife says, Μέχρι τίνος καρτερήσεις λέγων Ἰδοὺ ἀναμένω χρόνον ἔτι μικρὸν προσδεχόμενος τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς σωτηρίας μου;—then follows a lament on their unhappy lot, and she concludes, ἀλλὰ εἰπὼν τι ῥῆμα εἰς [v.l. πρὸς] κύριον καὶ τελεῖται. This last clause was evidently read by Cyprian in his Old Latin, for he quotes (*Testim.* iii. 14), 'Dic verbum aliquod in Dominum, et morere'; and again (*de Mort.* 6), 'Et cum eum uxor quoque sua compelleret, ut vi doloris impatiens aliquid adversus Deum querela et invidiosa voce loqueretur, respondit,' etc. On the other hand, the Clementine Vulgate reads, 'Adhuc tu permanes in simplicitate tua! Benedic Deo, et morere.' This evidence would support the suggestion in Mr. Bevan's note, THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, p. 190, if we might suppose that the Syriac and the LXX preserve here an older reading than that of the present Heb. text and the Vulgate. It is worth while pointing out that in 1 K 21<sup>10, 13</sup>, Job 11<sup>25</sup>, the LXX use εὐλογεῖν in agreement with the Heb. בָּרַךְ, while in all these places the Syriac uses the same word that it employs in Job 2<sup>9</sup>, meaning 'curse.' In Job 1<sup>5</sup>, where also the Syriac has 'curse,' the LXX gives κακὰ ἐνενόησαν πρὸς (v.l. πρὸς τὸν) Θεόν; and in Ps 10<sup>3</sup> the Syriac, LXX, and Vulgate refer the blessing to the wicked man and not to God (بَارِكْهُ, ἐνευλογεῖται, benedicitur). If we admit the suggestion offered in Mr. Bevan's note, must we



infer that the Syriac in these places preserves an older text than the LXX? If not, we must suppose that the Syriac translator, though reading בְּרָךְ, understood it to mean 'curse.'

Gesenius (*Thes.* 240) refers to Job 2<sup>9</sup> at length: '*Lauda Deum et morere, i.e. quantumvis Deum laudabis et celebrabis, tamen tibi mox moriendum est, vana igitur tua erga Deum pietas. Verba sunt mulieris impiæ . . . (Al. exsecrare Deum et morere . . . Al. valedicas Deo . . .)*'; and lower down, after saying that the Heb. בְּרָךְ also 'valet exsecratus est,' with examples 1 K 21<sup>10</sup>, Job 1<sup>5</sup>, Ps 10<sup>3</sup>, he adds: 'Nonnullos eodem referre verba ii. 9 supra observavimus. Alii, ut Schultensius ad Job l.c., quibus exsecrandi potestas in hoc vc. non satis certa videbatur, a valedicendo derivant abnegandi vim.' This latter is the rendering of the R.V. A curious translation of our passage is that by Tremellius and Junius in their version of the O.T. (ed. 1585, Londini), 'Adhuc retines integritatem tuam; benedicendo Deo atque moriendo?' and their comment is, 'Quasi dicat, adhuc in tua simplicitate persistis; quòd Deo isti benedicis, qui te in istas mortis angustias conjecit, nec usquam exitum ostendit? Sarcasmus.' Finally, if the passage be translated 'bless' or 'praise God,' in preference to 'curse' or the milder 'renounce' of the R.V., the context evidently requires that the words be regarded as an impious, or a sarcastic, or at least an impatient utterance fully deserving Job's rebuke.

ALBERT BONUS.

Alphington, Exeter.

## 'The Best Robe.'

THE R.V. did not consider it necessary to put in the margin, 'Gk., the first.' And yet the common explanation, 'fetch a good coat quickly—the best one,' is not the only possible explanation. In the Apostolic Constitutions (ii. 41, 2) the passage is paraphrased: τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἀπολωλότα τὸν ἄσικτον . . . μετὰ μουσικῶν ὁ φιλότεκνος πατὴρ προσελάβετο, καὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν στολὴν καὶ τὸν δακτύλιον καὶ τὰ ὑποδήματα ἀποδοῦς, i.e. 'giving back to him *his former coat*.' Just as Rebecca had the 'goodly raiment' of her eldest son with her in the house, in a similar way a good coat of the younger son may have been kept at home, despite of v.<sup>13</sup>. Like Joseph's coat of many colours, it may have been a comfort to the father. The Greek commentators are divided;

Euthymius explains it of the most costly, Theophylact in the way of the Constitutions.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

## Matt. vi. 24 = Luke xvi. 13.

'ELSE he will *hold* to (the) one and despise the other.'

No commentary which is at my disposal points to the fact that for ἀνέξεται there is a different reading ἀνέξεται, which deserves consideration.

In Matthew even Jerome kept 'unum sustinebit,' though the Brisciensis had 'uno obediēt.'

*Sustinebit* is found in the Corbeiensis.

The Colbertinus, Claromontanus, Veronensis, Vercellensis, Augustinus, Chromatius, Juvenius read *patietur*.

The same reading is attested by the Syrus-Curetonianus, the Sinaiticus being defective here.

In Luke both Syriac manuscripts testify for ἀνέξεται, and so do the Old Latin MSS *a, b, g, r* with their reading *patietur*, 'i.e. ἀνέξεται,' as is well remarked by Wordsworth-White.

From the Stoic formula ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου, *sustine et abstine* (German, *meide und leide*, or *halten und halten ab*), the verb was well known, so that different translators might find it in this sentence. Nevertheless, this new example of harmony between the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions is interesting.

P.S.—The same reading is attested in Matt. by the Palestinian Syriac, even with a pun between the roots סָבַר ('endure') and בָּסַר ('despise').

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

## The 'Dictionary of the Bible.' Abiud.

THE combination proposed in the article on the genealogy of Jesus Christ in the second volume (p. 140) with *Hodaviah* (1 Ch 3<sup>24</sup>) is rather doubtful. Abiud corresponds in the Septuagint to אֲבִיהוּא as well as to אֲבִיהוּד, and is explained by Philo as = πατήρ μου οὗτος. See *de Migratione*, § 31 (Mangey, i. 462), where all editions, even the latest of Wendland (2, 301), have marred Philo's etymology by wrong punctuation of the sentence.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

## In the Study.

### Œdipus and Isaiah.

WE are not bound to belittle any anticipation of an evangelical doctrine which we may find in another religion. Professor von Schubert (see the notice of the English translation of his *Church History* on another page) holds that 'the profoundest touch of the ancient Israelite scheme of salvation to be found anywhere in the Old Testament' is the figure of the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah. He believes, with Wellhausen, that the Servant in Isaiah suffers, not only for his own people, but for all peoples; and therein lies the profundity of it. Yet he finds a parallel in the pagan Greek religion: 'For,' says Œdipus in *Colonus* (i. 5), 'one soul could make atonement for the world if, impelled by a pure love, it gave itself up for the world.'

Professor von Schubert points out that this, 'the profoundest religious thought in the Old Testament,' had been completely lost sight of when Christ came. It was entirely absent from the picture of the Messiah in the time of Christ. He read the Old Testament and recovered it. Is not this originality?

### The Exhortation.

To the question, Should every sermon contain an exhortation? the answer is made that every sermon should be an exhortation. It was so with our Lord's sermons, with those sermons we call Parables. The hearer may miss the exhortation of the sermon. But that may be the hearer's fault. The exhortation is sometimes missed in the Parables. In the Parables of the Treasure Hidden in the Field and of the Pearl of Great Price, the attention is given to the treasure and the pearl. The exhortation, to sell, is missed. Yet we know, or ought to know, that, without selling out, the treasure or the pearl cannot be ours. So far as we are concerned the selling out is everything.

It was everything with our Lord. He Himself had sold out. Therefore the exhortation comes, and therefore with such persuasion. 'The quiet manner,' says Weinell, 'in which the immense religious demand of unconditional surrender is

stated here, so simply as though the matter were something quite obvious—all this can have issued only from the soul of One who Himself had given up everything for the kingdom's sake—calm of home life, quiet labour at His craft, security and peace of life, the paternal roof itself. In these two parables we find, not an excited "Thus it shall be," but a still and resolute "Thus it is," and "Thus it has been."

### To purchase a good Degree.

One of the ways, one of the best ways, is to pay the fees and join the Diploma Correspondence College. Its headquarters will be found now at Wolsey Hall, Oxford. The Secretary will send guides and specimen Examination Papers, and get any one's feet on the royal road to the Oxford B.D. (and D.D.), the London B.D., the Durham B.D.

### Truth or the Search for it.

Is it the possession of truth or the search for it that is best? Professor Lloyd, in his book on *The Will to Doubt*, with great confidence answers, the search for it. And he quotes the classical statement on the subject, the statement by Lessing: 'Not the truth that any one may have or may think he has, but the honest effort which has been exerted to compass it, makes what is really worthy in human life. For not in having, but in seeking truth, are those powers developed, in which alone man's ever-increasing perfection consists. Possession makes us inert, lazy, proud. If God held in His right hand the perfect truth, and in His left the ever-restless struggle after truth, and bade me choose, although I were bound to be ever and always in the wrong, I should humbly select the left, saying: "Father, give; surely the pure truth is for Thee alone."

### Two New Quarterlies.

The prophecy has often been made that the days of the Quarterly are numbered. Yet every new season a new Quarterly appears. This season there are two. The one is the *Harvard Theological Review* (Macmillan; 50 cents), the other is the *Irish Church Quarterly* (1s. 6d.)

The *Harvard* is fortunate in being partially endowed. The *Irish Church Quarterly* is to live



by its own attractiveness. And it has begun well. The first edition (how many copies?) was clean sold out in a fortnight. The *Harvard* is edited by Professors G. F. Moore, W. W. Fenn, and J. H. Ropes; the *Irish Church Quarterly* by Dr. Lawlor, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin.

#### Sinless or Sinful.

The controversy about the New Theology seems to have come to an end. Has it done anything for us? Yes, it has done one thing. It has made it clear as it never was clear before, at least to the average understanding, that theologians are divided into two distinct and irreconcilable parties, and that the dividing line is the sinlessness of Jesus.

The New Theology has not told us how many of the preachers of our day are on the one side or the other. The men of the New Theology themselves may not all deny the sinlessness of Jesus. Two of them have published books in which they merely refuse to affirm it. As we shall see, to refuse to affirm is in this case to deny. Others, however, may be able to receive it. The New Theologians have not told us how many even of their own number are on the one side or the other. But they have enabled us to see that all other signs of separation are illusory or insignificant. This is the real dividing line in theology. Do we believe that Jesus was sinless, or do we believe that He was sinful?

Sinless or sinful. Because if Jesus committed sin at all, the question of degree is not worth discussing. We all receive the example of His life. We all acknowledge that, comparatively speaking, He was a good man. But what that amounts to in the judgment of Jesus Himself we see in the incident of the rich young ruler. 'Good Master!' 'Why callest thou me good?' If he meant that Jesus was only comparatively good, it was not worth while calling Him good. It has never been felt by any man that it was worth while calling Him good. If He was only comparatively good, He must have known that He was not good. The acceptance of the epithet 'good' could mean nothing less than the consciousness that He was sinless.

We say, then, that the question whether Jesus was sinful or sinless is the question which separates

one theologian from another. And it is a question upon which every man may be brought to the test. Not that we would encourage a heresy hunt. God forbid. From the beginning the heresy hunter has been the arch heretic. But every man is bound to consider where he stands. And this is the opportunity. Does he believe that Jesus was sinless, or does he not? On the Divinity of Christ a man, if he has skill in the management of language, may be anywhere. But the sinlessness of Jesus is an evident issue. We must believe either that Jesus was sinless, or that He was sinful.

The Rev. E. Griffith-Jones, B.A., lately appointed Principal of the Yorkshire United College, has issued a volume of sermons. Its title is *Faith and Verification* (Clarke & Co.; 5s.). One of the sermons deals with 'The Sinlessness of Jesus.' In that sermon Mr. Griffith-Jones shows that an agnostic attitude is impossible here. A man must believe that Jesus was sinless, or that He was sinful.

For the proof of the sinlessness of Jesus lies in Christ's own consciousness. The unbeliever, seeking to find shelter in agnosticism, says we know little of the first thirty years of Jesus' life. It is true. We know very little. And if we had nothing but the evidence of the events to guide us, we could not possibly say that Jesus was sinless. The agnostic attitude might then be the only attitude for all of us. But we are not dependent on the outward incidents. We can come to the consciousness of Jesus concerning Himself.

For this, says Mr. Griffith-Jones, 'is one of the most wonderful things about our Gospel narratives, that while they profess to give us only the story of Jesus's life, His words, and His actions, and His outward career, they do let us into the secret of His inner life. Somehow, we can scarcely tell how, they take us by the hand, and enable us to step across that magic line of separation, that threshold of reserve, which guards the unseen life of one man from the intrusion of another.' They present us, he says, not with a picture of Jesus, or with four different pictures of Jesus, but with His very soul. They lift the veil, and we look into His very heart; we feel His presence; we know Him for what He is.

And what do we find? We find an entire



absence of the consciousness of sin. The unbeliever quotes the passage from St. John: 'Which of you convicteth me of sin?' and proceeds to doubt its authenticity. His labour is thrown away. The Synoptics are full of the absence. But apart from the occasions on which sin, if it had been there, would have been acknowledged, there is the whole atmosphere of the Gospels. It is an atmosphere which cannot be mistaken. From beginning to end Jesus is represented as living in conscious freedom from sin. From beginning to end we feel and know that that representation is just.

#### The Revue Bénédictine.

For all students of ecclesiology, the *Revue Bénédictine* is indispensable. And if the *Revue* itself is indispensable, how indispensable must be the Index which, under the title of 'Table des Matières,' has been published, covering the years 1884-1904. Make inquiry at the Abbey of Maredsous in Belgium; or in Paris at Quai Voltaire 9; or in St. Louis, Mo., at 17 South Broadway. Why is there no dépôt in England?

#### The Image of God.

The question about the Higher Criticism is now a practical one. What use can be made of it in the pulpit? The best answer will be found in Professor Gordon's *Early Traditions of Genesis* (T. & T. Clark; 6s. net). Dr. Gordon is a preacher. He writes for preachers. He has himself been able to preach sermons from the Book of Genesis which are loyal to modern knowledge.

Suppose the text were Gn 1<sup>26</sup>. The subject is the Image of God. What does 'the image of God' consist in? It consists in man's dominion over the creatures, says Holzinger. But, says Dr. Gordon, that is going round the idea, not grappling with the heart of it; that is the result, not the essential quality, of the image. The image of God, said the older dogmatics, was some quality which belonged to 'unfallen' man. One part of the 'woe' which 'the fruit of that forbidden tree' brought into the world was the loss of the image of God. But the older dogmatics knew nothing of Higher Criticism.

In P's account of the early history of man there is no Fall. In his story of the Creation and man's subsequent history the 'image' belongs to man as

man. It is handed down from Adam to Seth (Gn 5<sup>3</sup>). From Seth it passes to succeeding generations by ordinary descent.

What is the image, then? It is all that we mean by personality. It includes man's external appearance. But the emphasis lies on his intellectual, ethical, and religious powers and capacities. The essence of the Hebrew conception of God, says Professor Gordon, is His ethical personality. God endows man with the same. This is indeed the underlying assumption of the whole of the Old Testament. This makes possible the unveiling of God to man and the approach of man to God. God made man in His own image, and so the Word had flesh and dwelt among us.

#### A Thank-offering.

The *Memoirs of Archbishop Temple*, published in 1906, was a bulky and expensive book. Seven authors were engaged on it, one of whom was Archdeacon Sandford, who was also the editor. Archdeacon Sandford has now republished his own contribution separately under the title of *Frederick Temple, an Appreciation* (Macmillan; 4s. net). The volume contains also a biographical introduction by Mr. William Temple, Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, son of the Archbishop.

In one of the letters which Archdeacon Sandford quotes, there is an exposition of a verse in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. It is the difficult verse 1 Co 10<sup>17</sup>, 'For we, being many, are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.' The translation in the Revised Version is different, but the difference is inconsiderable, and Dr. Temple does not trouble himself with that. The date of his letter is April 26, 1852.

Dr. Temple starts with the statement that the idea of the Lord's Supper is founded on the Jewish Passover Offering. He finds his proof in the next verse, which in this case is distinctly more accurate in the Revised Version: 'Behold Israel after the flesh: have not they which eat the sacrifices communion with the altar?' It was in the Jewish Peace-offering that the worshippers ate of the sacrifices.

Now the idea of the Peace-offering, as distinguished from the other sacrifices of the Jews,



rested on the mysterious unity of animal life. That mysterious unity was used as a symbol to express the bond that was formed between man and man, and between man and God. Those who had eaten of one animal were, so to speak, bound together by the secret tie which once bound together the parts of the animal. These parts, when eaten, retained their mutual attraction, and made the eaters, in some sense, one flesh. This idea is transferred to the Lord's Supper. By being partakers of one bread we are united the one to the other, and all to the Lord, whose Body the bread is, and we may be spoken of as 'one bread, one body.'

So the first conclusion at which Dr. Temple arrives is that the Lord's Supper is a Thank-offering or Eucharist, not a Burnt-offering or Sin-offering. The next is that the body of the animal and the bread of the Eucharist, both being dead, have no uniting power in themselves, but are solely symbols of union. It is only when food offered to idols is eaten as a sign of demon worship that the heathen altar becomes a 'table of devils.' And it is only when the bread is eaten as a sign or symbol of the Lord's Body that the Christian Altar becomes a 'table of the Lord.' 'If,' says Dr. Temple, 'St. Paul had been asked whether the consecrated elements were, or contained, the Body of the Lord in *any* sense, he would have repudiated such an expression. In the bread *so* eaten, and in the communicants *so* eating, there is the Body; but the elements themselves are "nothing in the world."'

#### The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. D. Macfadyen, M.A., Highgate, London, N.

Illustrations for the Great Text for April must be received by the 1st of March. The text is Lk 21<sup>19</sup>.

The Great Text for May is Lk 22<sup>19</sup>—'And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.' A copy of Bennett's *The Post-Exilic Prophets* or of Scott's *The Fourth Gospel* will be given for the best illustration. Illustrations must be received by the 1st of April.

The Great Text for June is Lk 23<sup>34</sup>—'Then

said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do. And they parted his raiment, and cast lots.' A copy of Bennett's *The Post-Exilic Prophets* or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration. Illustrations must be received by the 1st of May.

The Great Text for July is Lk 23<sup>43</sup>—'And he said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.' A copy of Chadwick's *Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul* or of Adamson's *Christian Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* will be given for the best illustration. Illustrations must be received by the 1st of June.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

#### The Great Texts of Isaiah.

The best illustrations in Isaiah have been found by the following:—

- 1<sup>3</sup> Rev. J. Hannah, Stafford.
- 1<sup>18</sup> J. W. Macdonald, Esq., N. Shields.
- 2<sup>4</sup> Rev. W. M. Grant, Markham, Ont.
- 6<sup>1-3</sup> Rev. W. Venis Robinson, B.A., Huntingdon.
- 6<sup>8</sup> Rev. C. W. Allan, Wesleyan Mission, Hankow, China.
- 9<sup>6</sup> Rev. R. Whyte, B.D., Portobello.
- 11<sup>6</sup> " " "
- 12<sup>3</sup> Rev. G. P. Robertson, M.A., Stoneykirk.
- 21<sup>11, 12</sup> Rev. R. Elliott, Leyton, E.
- 32<sup>2</sup> Rev. T. J. Pennell, Coseley, Bilston.
- 33<sup>17</sup> Rev. W. Hetherington, Plumstead, S.E.
- 40<sup>3</sup> Rev. G. P. Robertson, M.A., Stoneykirk.
- 40<sup>31</sup> Rev. James Dinwoodie, Trinity U.F. Manse, Kelt.
- 42<sup>8</sup> Rev. W. K. H. Macdonald, Glanton S.O., Northumberland.
- 50<sup>10</sup> Rev. W. J. F. Maguire, Warrenpoint, Ireland.
- 53<sup>8</sup> Rev. W. Forbes, Cairneyhill Manse, Dunfermline.
- 53<sup>4, 5</sup> Rev. T. Graham, Pickering, Yorks.
- 53<sup>6</sup> D. M. Henry, M.A., Whithorn.
- 55<sup>1</sup> Isaac Tambyah, Esq., Jaffna, Ceylon.
- 55<sup>6, 7</sup> Arthur Dakin, Esq., Rawdon College, nr. Leeds.
- 60<sup>1</sup> Rev. R. Elliott, Leyton, E.
- 61<sup>1</sup> Rev. D. M. Henry, M.A., Whithorn.
- 63<sup>9</sup> Rev. W. V. Robinson, B.A., Huntingdon.

Would those who have not already named the book which they desire kindly do so?

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.